The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXII, No. 2 FEBRUARY, 1950

CONTENTS

A Communication from His Excellency Msgr. Montini . . 81

Should We Support Socialized Medicine?
Msgr. William J. McDonald 82

Recent Dogmatic Theology . *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 97

The "Catholic" Viewpoint on Industry Councils
William J. Smith, S.J. 107

Caesaropapism in Action . . . *Thomas Owen Martin* 121

Backgrounds of Secularism . . . *Robert F. Drinan, S.J.* 132

The New Hebrew Manuscripts. Part II
Edward P. Arbez, S.S. 137

Regina Patriarcharum . . . . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 146

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Voluntary Substitution of the Office 150

Nuns on Ash Wednesday 150

Cloth of Gold for the Ciborium Veil 151

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1950, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

John Cardinal or Cardinal John? 151

The Composition of Incense 152

Burial in a Non-Catholic Cemetery 152

Mass Stipends 153

BOOK REVIEWS

Truth in the Morning, *by Sister Mary Charitas* 155

Tractatus Dogmaticus de Eucharistia. Tome II. *by Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I.* 156

The Chosen, *by E. J. Edwards* 157

A Popular History of the Catholic Church, *by Philip Hughes* 157

Who Shall Bear the Flame? *by Cardinal Saliege* 159

The Laws of Holy Mass, *translated by Joseph Francis* . . 159

BY POPULAR DEMAND ! !

A new edition of an outstanding work printed entirely from new plates—

The Life of Jesus Christ In Meditations

By

M. MESCHLER, S.J.

Translated by Sister Mary Margaret, O.S.B.

Two Volumes, $12.00

This two-volume life of Christ in meditations is a series of spiritual reflections based directly on the events and discourses in the life of our Savior. In each instance the author begins with the Gospel narrative, which is followed by an account of the historical and other circumstances. These sections would, if pieced together, constitute a chronological life of Christ, beginning with the life of the Word in the bosom of the Trinity from all eternity, and concluding with the eternal glory of the God-man at the right hand of the Father.

Then follow the devout reflections. Of course the deeds and words of our Lord are an inexhaustible source of doctrinal and moral teaching. From this treasure Father Meschler has drawn a wealth of spiritual interpretation and application.

For the convenience of preachers an appendix has been added to provide a quick reference to the commentary on each Sunday's Gospel. An alphabetic index serves the same purpose in different form.

FROM YOUR BOOKSTORE OR FROM

B. HERDER BOOK COMPANY

15 and 17 South Broadway St. Louis 2, Missouri

SEGRETERIA DI STATO
DI
SUA SANTITÀ

N. 215.682

VATICAN CITY, December 2, 1949

Dear Father Fenton,

It is my pleasant duty to acknowledge receipt, on behalf of the Holy Father, of the October 1949 issue of the American Ecclesiastical Review which you forwarded to Him recently through the good offices of His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate.

His Holiness warmly appreciates the sentiments of devoted filial homage which inspired you to send Him this excellently bound volume, commemorating the sixtieth anniversary of the American Ecclesiastical Review, and He would have me convey to you His expression of heartfelt gratitude.

With an earnest prayer that Our Divine Lord may prosper your efforts to inculcate in the minds of an ever increasing number of readers, a profound knowledge of the truths of our holy religion, the Holy Father cordially imparts to you and to those who are associated with you in editing this publication, His paternal Apostolic Benediction.

Availing myself of the occasion to renew to you my sentiments of esteem and respectful consideration, I remain,

Sincerely yours in Christ,

J B Montini
Subst.

Rev. Joseph C. Fenton, Editor
American Ecclesiastical Review,
Catholic University,
Washington, D.C.
U. S. A.

SHOULD WE SUPPORT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE?

The compulsory health insurance program, now pending before Congress, has pointed up what is undoubtedly one of the sharpest issues of our time. In our attempt to combat "galloping Communism" are we slowly but surely falling victims to "creeping Socialism"? It would be tragic indeed if in attempting to quell the flaming faith of totalitarian zealots we ourselves should slip into some basically similar system of collectivism in the shape of a welfare or, if you will, a slave State. For the clergy especially this should constitute a matter of deep concern since the Papal Encyclicals are crystal clear in their condemnation of outright socialism. In an effort toward clarification of this vital question we shall try to offer here a summary review of the main facts and specific issues involved. Other larger and perhaps more interesting phases of the problem lie outside our present scope.[1]

Although the proper care of health is not quite on a par with the ownership of property the principles pertinent to the nationalization of industry, which we have already reviewed, will be helpful in giving us a general picture or pattern of Catholic thought relative to more personal problems.[2] This pattern accords very well with the American tradition which has been to encourage, in

[1] One wonders, for instance, how certain aspects of the whole present philosophy of planned security and a completely comfortable society are to be harmonized with the Christian ideal. True, as *Quadragesimo anno* points out and *Divini Redemptoris* repeats, we should strive for a sound economic order in which everyone would have "sufficient to supply all necessities and reasonable comforts" because the higher standard of life thus attained "provided it be used with prudence is not only not a hindrance but is of singular help to virtue." At the same time it would be misleading to over-emphasize mere social and economic remedies in such a way as to convey the impression that these are the primary business of the Church. Actually, in practice, the advocacy of such remedies must ultimately lead to further control by the State. Neil Kevin in *No Applause in Church* has some appropriate remarks in the section "On Putting the Second Commandment First." From the point of view of the opportunity for asceticism in the welfare society his delightful description of how many contemporary daily annoyances can be more irritating than a hair-shirt is also relevant.

[2] Cf. "Nationalization and the Catholic Tradition," *AER*, CXXII, 1 (Jan. 1950). The problem of health has, of course, obvious connection with basic living standards, education, etc.

so far as is consonant with social welfare, individuals and groups to solve their own difficulties in their own way. The very variety existing in the different states and regions makes this approach more necessary here than, for instance, in the smaller, tighter countries of Europe. Our political and social history as well as the continuing progress of our free way of life require a broader and more equitable basis for insuring personal and national well-being. It is not in the American spirit to risk the curtailment of basic liberties even in the interest of supposedly greater security. Nevertheless, as we have seen, the increasing complexity of modern life and the enormous power wielded by huge, wealthy organizations seems to necessitate a larger protective rôle on the part of the government than at any time in the past.

SOCIALIZED OR STATE MEDICINE?

It is still true, however, that, as in the case of education, the matter of health is not the government's primary responsibility. Therefore it becomes important to determine what precisely the proposed health measure means. What has been frequently forgotten in the debate so far is that socialized medicine differs from State medicine. Lest Catholics be scared by accusations of near-Socialism we must explain that "socialization" is not necessarily Socialism, much less "nationalization." When any group of individuals promotes a program of medical services designed to mutualize cost and care we have socialized medicine. It may mean a system of free medical practice sponsored, financed by, and responsible to the government but organized, operated, and regulated democratically by the medical and allied professions.

Socialized medicine may thus be a very broad term covering the whole science and art of preventing and curing disease through collective effort with the financial support of social groups and governmental units. It might be said that anything is socialized when it is supported by people as groups according to ability to pay, rather than by individuals according to use. A public library is a socialized institution since it is maintained by the taxpayers. The citizen with the most property pays the largest sum toward its support whereas the school child who occasionally takes out a book pays nothing. Private physicians in a sense socialize medicine when

they charge according to the patient's respective financial status and make the wealthy help pay for the poor.

In the case of State medicine the control is not in the hands of the physicians. Such a system is run by the government for the medical and allied professions. Medical services are furnished by State employees who are paid out of taxes much as public education is conducted by teachers paid from public funds. There are two main differences between State medicine and health insurance. The first concerns means of support, the second, methods of administration. (1) State medicine secures its support from taxation: health insurance from periodic payments of those insured. (2) State medicine implies an organization of medical practitioners working directly for the State. Health insurance would be maintained by the medical societies or insurance companies with State supervision; it is really a plan for private medicine with group support.

True health insurance, paid for by the purchasers, may be voluntary but the social insurance type is compulsory. Otherwise those receiving larger incomes would not be likely to join. When each person is compelled to belong and to pay according to his ability, rather than according to the service he is to receive, this method of support comes very close to being a form of taxation. A system of health insurance enforced by law and supported on the basis of ability to pay is almost State medicine. If the government, in addition to collecting the funds, insists on maintaining rigid supervision of the medical services offered then the system is practically State medicine.

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

Another popular misconception is that socialized medicine is something entirely new. Actually it has been advocated and tried in one form or another and in various parts of the world for almost a century. As far back as 1864 Russia established a rather complete system of State medicine for the rural districts. In the past, when the Soviet Union was somewhat more accessible to foreigners, it was studied by American physicians and some, notably Dr. Sigerst of Johns Hopkins, seemed to regard it as satisfactory. Germany experimented with it on a large scale when, in 1883, Bismarck introduced comprehensive social and health insurance for industrial workers. Later it was extended to commercial employees

and agricultural laborers. Medical care was, in fact, free—at least in the sense that the patient made no direct payment for the service. The entire cost came out of a fund raised by general taxation. The German system spread to Austria in 1888 and was introduced in France in a modified form in 1918. Later the Scandinavian countries followed and in South America Chile has had compulsory insurance since 1927.

In England, under Lloyd George, a national health insurance act was passed in 1911. In more recent times the Beveridge Report presented a comprehensive system of social planning but it did not decide the question as to whether a national health and hospital service should be established and maintained by the State. Under the present Labor government, however, "panel medicine" was set up. At first opposed strenuously by the British Medical Association it is said that now most physicians are sufficiently satisfied with it not to desire a return of the old "rugged individualism."[3] The doctors are paid according to the number of patients cared for each year at the rate of $2.16 per patient. It is, of course, too soon to pass judgment on a system still in the throes of its growing pains but already costs have increased at such a rate as to be alarming. The Health Minister has found it necessary to reduce expenses by imposing a twenty-five per cent cut on dentists and by slashing $38,000,000 from the hospital budget. While theoretically the patient may change doctors at will, in practice it appears that such a transfer requires the permission of his former physician and the approval of a government board.

New Zealand enacted extensive social security legislation in 1938 which covered all phases of health. The New Zealand system also has a pension clause. With a doctor's certificate one can get on the pension list, at least temporarily, and sometimes for life. The annual cost is $60 per person. It is levied as a direct tax of five and

[3] On a recent visit to England the writer observed that while there was considerable "griping" about the loop-holes in the new system, e.g. the fact that production of free "spectacles" lagged behind to the tune of more than a million and a half with the result that before they were delivered the prescription already needed to be changed, nevertheless, there was no thought of going back to the past. It is also indicative of the modern temper that the recent defeat of the Labor party in New Zealand was made possible only because their opponents pledged themselves to retain most of the existing social welfare program.

a half cents out of every dollar paid in wages and the balance comes out of a general fund. It is, perhaps, worth noting that Ireland still pursues the traditional program of personal medicine with, however, free "dispensaries" to provide medical care for those unable to pay. Care is thus provided for the poor while insurance is compulsory for the working classes. An Irish physician, writing recently in *Studies,* points out that the preservation of this doctor-patient relationship is "both the true expression of our individualistic outlook and a far humaner basis than the card-index and the case-number which has so benumbed much of modern continental practice."

From time to time it had been suggested that one or other of these European plans be introduced into the United States. The chief objection thus far has been that economic and social conditions are different in America. The various states have not sufficient uniformity to warrant that any system yet devised would be successful in meeting the needs of the country as a whole. It was assumed that the development of sickness insurance would have to be on a local rather than on a national level, and the basic contention of the American Medical Association has been that the promotion of public health and medical care are primarily local responsibilities. The determination of needs and the administration of affairs should be in the hands of local authorities. Grants in aid and technical assistance may be received from State and Federal Government sources but not the determination of policy.

The United States Government held a conference in July, 1938, to discuss a new and better system for the distribution of medical care to the poor. One hundred seventy-one delegates from various professions were present. In the following year Senator Wagner of New York introduced the National Health Act or, as it is sometimes called, the Wagner Health Bill. The bill was based upon the findings of the Health Conference and was intended to fill the gaps in the Social Security Act.

Toward the end of 1948 Oscar Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, submitted a report to the President on the state of the nation's health and on plans to raise the national health level during the next decade. The report recommended that "further rapid improvement in national health can be achieved only by concerted

effort and that the need for increased Federal action is imperative.. . . ."[4]

TERMS OF PROPOSED MEASURE

Now we come to the heart of the present controversy—the National Health Program requested by the President which, following his special message on April 22, 1949, was submitted as an improved comprehensive health bill by eight Senators and two Congressmen. We shall try to see both what is expressed and what is implied in this bill. In its wording, at least, it guarantees that payments for benefits shall be in proportion to incomes, and persons "shall, therefore, obtain services as a right and not as a charity." This aspect is lauded by its proponents on the ground that subsidies to voluntary plans for those unable to pay premiums would necessarily involve the indignities of a "means test" and thus be a reversion to "the outmoded charity principle."

The bill also theoretically guarantees patients free choice of doctors and it is inferred that many will have this privilege for the first time who have hitherto been prevented by their economic condition. Furthermore, "physicians and other professions furnishing services to them shall be assured freedom in the practice of their profession and assistance in maintaining high standards, and that the administration of this act shall be based upon the American principle of decentralization." Administrative responsibility is to be placed "in the hands of local bodies representing both those who pay for and those who render services, and operating within the framework of plans made by the several states." One wonders in this connection what will happen to volunteer non-profit plans which may appear to be in competition with the state medical societies? In England Catholic hospitals were, presumably, exempt by special privilege. Are we to have a repetition of the so-called "divisive" effects of public versus private education here with Catholics once again in the unjust position of having to bear a double burden?

Of course, and again in theory, there is the banning of "discrim-

[4] Cf. *The Nation's Health. A Ten Year Program.* By Oscar R. Ewing. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1948), p. 12.

inations because of race, color, or creed." What a hackneyed meaningless phrase that has become! It is said that the private relationship that should exist between doctor and patient will be scrupulously protected. Also that all the people will be completely protected, but this sounds too much of a panacea to be interpreted literally. Grants are promised to professional schools for research and aid to under-doctored areas in the form of ambulance services and subsidies, all of which could and should be forthcoming without benefit of any such comprehensive scheme as is proposed. Again and again it is insisted that government control will be at a minimum and that the net result will be stimulation of high quality medical care. All this may indeed be genuine wishful thinking as far as the blueprint is concerned but will it be translated into reality with the actual operation of the plan?

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR

A summary review of the reasons given for and against the new health measure may prove helpful at this stage. The affirmative position generally stresses the points already mentioned, namely: (1) the comprehensiveness of the plan; (2) the completeness of its coverage; (3) the high quality of the care offered; and (4) the lack of loopholes in administration.

(1) It is asserted that eighty-five million Americans have now no protection against crippling sickness costs. On the basis of present statistics voluntary plans are considered inadequate as hospitalization insurance is carried by only 27 million people and hospitalization insurance plus physician's services in hospital by approximately the same number while only 3½ millions have really comprehensive, including preventive, care. Moreover it is claimed that the voluntary plans, since they have no sliding scale of payments to match salary, would be forever beyond the reach of the middle-income group which needs protection most.

(2) Voluntary health insurance, it is said, can cover only part of the subscriber's annual sickness bills. Hospitalization insurance, such as the Blue Cross, covers only 21 per cent of the average family's medical expenses and the Blue Shield, which includes

physician's services in a hospital, only 35 per cent.[5] Neither do these provide for check-ups, inoculations, and preventive care. Medical services, on the other hand, provided by the community, or government at the public expense, can be as complete as is necessary or desirable. Both the financial burden and the social stigma attaching to those forced to accept present-day free services would vanish as also the evils of self-diagnosis, self-medication, and patent medicine, because of the easy access to competent advice and service.

(3) Moreover, the professionals themselves will benefit from this public financing. There will be no need of competition: there will be no over-supply or unemployment resulting from unequal distribution of personnel; and they will no longer be harassed by the problem of income since it is assured by the government.

The economic and professional assurance that is inherent in public service; the definite compensation; the permanent tenure of office enforced by civil service law; the security of old age and disability through pension retirement; the regular and orderly condition and hours of service; the assured opportunities for rest, recreation, and travel; the opportunities for advancement; for further professional study, for research, for public education, public and preventive medicine, are but a few of the innumerable advantages of a publicly provided and supported medical service, which are denied today to most of the professional workers in the health service.

(4) There will be no danger to professional freedom since all medical matters will be left strictly in the hands of the doctors. Neither will there be any infringement of the patient's right to privacy. He may go to a doctor of his own choosing or change doctors, supposedly, at will. Sound administration requires a division of responsibility between the professionals who provide the health services and the consumers who pay for them. To deny the public its proper voice in the administration of voluntary programs is to invest medical societies with all the powers of a monopoly and

[5] Agnes E. Meyer in an address entitled, "A Sound National Health Program," reprinted from *The Washington Post*, Nov. 14, 1948, claims that "the Blue Shield, which is dominated by doctors, has no standards of medical care, whereas the best cooperative insurance groups under lay control have succeeded in establishing standards over the opposition of the medical profession" (pp. 7 f.).

none of the checks against the abuse of that power. (And yet, as the British physician, Lord Horder, pointed out in a recent address, only the doctors really know what is good, and what is not good, medicine.) Ewing, in rejecting voluntary insurance, concludes that three factors, the inadequacy of benefits offered, of the number of people covered, and of the distribution of coverage, outbalance all others.[6]

THE NEGATIVE SIDE

Impressive as these arguments may be in theory we cannot overlook the fact that there are also some serious objections to the proposed measure. Since it would be impossible even to outline them here in any detail we must be content to summarize them under three headings: (1) bureaucracy; (2) politics; (3) regimentation.

(1) If the plan were enacted medical authorities say most doctors would choose the fee-basis method of payment. This, naturally, would require vastly more records and administrative machinery. Despite the protests of non-interference (like Shakespeare, one suspects too much protesting here!) there would have to be regulations under Federal direction for checking and paying claims. The load would become so great that the system of compensation would eventually move to the capitation method, as in Britain. This practically makes the doctors public functionaries working on government salary. Physicians say that during the last war they feared the tyranny of paper work more than bullets, bombs, or disease. It would, in fact, be impossible for them to look after the details of administration in addition to their purely professional duties. The cost of a huge army of officers, investigators, auditors, and clerks would be added to the budget and the whole project would fall into the clutches of bureaucracy.

(2) For the abuses which the plan would abolish it would substitute political control which in turn, would lead to even graver evils. The handling of government forms, records, and cards necessary for the myriad medical services and drugs required would not only be a waste of tax money. Past experience indicates the ever-present danger of graft and corruption. Political control in medicine is especially dangerous since it places the mass of the people, who may need medical attention but know little about re-

[6] Cf. Ewing, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

quirements and results, entirely at the mercy of non-medical dispensers of public health. Consequently some authoritative studies, such as that contained in the report of the Brookings Institution, oppose the government health insurance plan as revolutionary and dangerous, tending to freeze policies and eventually retard medical progress.[7]

(2) It follows immediately that the result is likely to be regimentation in various forms. The doctor's offices, already overcrowded, would become veritable assembly lines. One can easily imagine how hypochondriacs would take advantage of this free attention![8] The standardization might necessarily extend itself to diagnosis and prescriptions in some such form as: all those who suffer from headaches take so-and-so. But headaches can arise from different causes and the doctor himself would, in all probability, suffer most. In short, the service would inevitably tend to become soulless.

TOWARD A SOLUTION

While one naturally tends to admire the idealism manifested by many proponents of the plan we must be on guard against utopian dreams. The fact is that complete medical service for all is an objective extremely difficult to realize. State medicine elsewhere has worked no miracles. It is one thing to admit that the nation's health is in serious condition (although it is not as deplorable as sometimes described since about 80 per cent of the people receive good medical care) but it is quite another to claim that only a compulsory system can provide a satisfactory solution.[9] It is recognized that, generally speaking, the rich and the poor fare well enough in this respect. It is a question mainly of providing for middle-income families and for rural districts. The leaks and gaps in the present system certainly require attention but the system itself need not necessarily be scrapped. Nationalization means getting things the hard way. It is like taking over a hotel simply because you can't get a room for the night!

[7] Cf. G. W. Bachman and Lewis Merriam, *The Issue of Compulsory Health Insurance* (Washington, D. C., 1948).

[8] In Britain a nominal charge per visit has been recently imposed on each patient in an effort to prevent this.

[9] According to Ewing every year 325,000 die who could be saved by existing knowledge and skills. Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 1.

We have already seen the general principles governing Catholic thought in this matter.[10] The government charged with promoting the general welfare certainly has some responsibility for the maintenance of proper health standards.[11] Therefore it should supply help where needed and it has, in fact, been doing this. To supplement the present aid, the American Medical Association, at its 1949 Convention, offered to sponsor a twelve-point health program. This would set up an independent national health agency, establish a national science foundation, and encourage rapid extension of voluntary hospital and medical care insurance. In addition, it recommends the establishment of a medical care authority in each State to administer and distribute government funds as well as extension of hospital and diagnostic facilities and the expansion of public health education.

The Catholic tradition, here or elsewhere, is that the function of government is to aid and encourage but not to replace and control. It shall step in only when individuals and voluntary groups fail to do the job. Universal well-being is not to be expected from the State's activity, says Pope Pius XI:

> Just as it is gravely wrong to take from individuals what they accomplish by their own initiative and industry and give it to the community, so also it is an injustice and at the same time a grave evil and disturbance of right order to assign to a greater and higher association what lesser and subordinate organizations can do. For every social activity ought of its very nature to furnish help to the members of the body social, and never destroy or absorb them.[12]

Therefore, as in the case of education and in economic matters, health is not the primary responsibility of the government.

[10] Cf. "Nationalization and the Catholic Tradition," *AER*, CXXII, 1 (Jan. 1950).

[11] It is not so much the principle of taxation for health insurance which is opposed as the monopoly which would result under the government system. Cf. *A Voluntary Approach to a National Health Program* (St. Louis, Mo.: The Catholic Hospital Association), p. 8.

[12] *Quadragesimo anno*, New Translation. (Washington, D. C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1942), par. 79. This warning of the Holy Father was literally verified recently when the Royal Commission on Population urged the British Government to give free advice on birth control under the National Health Service.

The Church has as its long range objective the creation of a new society in which the emphasis will be on having less needy for the benefits than more benefits for the needy. Meanwhile it is realistic enough to recognize that something must be done immediately to patch up the evils of the existing order. Hence its advocacy of a family wage. As far back as 1919 the Bishop's Program for the United States stipulated that "wages should be high enough to make possible that amount of saving which is necessary to protect the worker and his family against sickness, accident, invalidity and old age." It is interesting also that the Hierarchy adds that "those women who are engaged in the same tasks as men should receive equal pay for equal service."

Pope Pius XI in *Atheistic Communism* insists that

> Social justice cannot be said to have been satisfied as long as workers are denied a salary that will enable them to secure proper sustenance for themselves and their families . . . as long as they cannot make suitable provision through public and private insurance for old age, for periods of illness and unemployment.[13]

The present Holy Father is even more specific. In his address to the Italian workers in 1944 he asks for a salary which will not only be sufficient to cover the living expenses of a family but which will make it possible to rear healthy, nourished children as well as to foresee and forestall times of stress, sickness, and old age. The State, whose duty it is to promote the common good should supply support "through social institutions such as insurance and social security societies."

In line with this general philosophy three important Catholic agencies, the NCWC Bureau of Health and Hospitals, the National Conference of Catholic Charities, and the Catholic Hospital Association have made public a statement called *A Voluntary Approach to a National Health Program.* The statement, which warns against the monopoly that would inevitably result from a government system of compulsory health insurance wisely notes that "a right approach to the problem depends not only on a correct analysis of the concrete situation, but also on a correct social philosophy."

[13] *Divini Redemptoris,* in *Five Great Encyclicals* (New York: The Paulist Press, 1939), p. 196.

Bishop Karl J. Alter, in a foreword, describes the discussion as revolving in large part around the issue of an exclusive and compulsory government health system versus private and voluntary efforts supported by government assistance instead of control. "Many competent authorities fear that an exclusive state system under a compulsory tax will necessarily involve a loss of freedom for the voluntary health agencies and put an end to private initiative to the ultimate detriment of the health of the nation."[14] Society, he says, is a much broader concept than the State which, indeed, has a definite responsibility; but voluntary agencies also have a right "to exercise an important function in planning as well as executing such a program. Monopoly means control; partnership means freedom."

The Catholic program is based on the principle of subsidiarity mentioned in our previous article. With a view to safeguarding moral and social principles which should underlie the problem of national health as well as the proper autonomy of hospitals and professional groups it is recommended that a division of health be created within the Federal Security Administration composed of nine members; three physicians, three hospital administrators (one a nurse), and three representatives of the public. Similar health councils should also be established at state and local levels. This program would also cover dentists, nurses, practical nurses, and other professional personnel. It is unnecessary to elaborate further on it here as the details are easily available. The main advantage from our point of view is that "under localized sponsorship and administration, health care by pre-payment of cost on a universal basis could be obtained by all residents of a state. At the same time, there would be developed a strong incentive to utilize the voluntary systems and extend this coverage."[15]

* * * * *

For the sake of brevity and clarity we shall conclude with the following observations from the Catholic point of view:

[14] Cf. *A Voluntary Approach* etc. Foreword by Bishop Alter, pp. 3 f.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 19. Cf. also, in reference to combining public and private action in a democratic society, *Voluntary Social Services: Their Place in the Modern State*, edited by A. F. C. Bourdillon (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1945).

(1) Physical health, important though it be, is not the highest good. If it were we might ask—even on the purely human level—why nearly a million of our citizens, the flower of our manhood, were but recently sacrificed on the battlefields of the world? It was, of course, a recognition of the fact that there are certain principles the defense of which is more important than human health or even life itself. Incidentally, if only the untold millions now lavished on the race for armaments and weapons of destruction could be channelled into a universal health program we might succeed in creating, if not a brave new world, at least one that would be, under God, reasonably strong and free.

(2) We must not blindly oppose every co-operative endeavor for mass health protection. Instead, however, of authoritarian, over-centralized plans for a Federally dominated organization with a top-heavy bureaucracy we favor a decentralized national health program which, based on sound principles and recognizing the elementary rights of every citizen, is at the same time dynamic in the sense of being responsive to local and changing community needs. This is in accordance with the thoroughly American and Catholic tradition of Federal, State and community co-operation and is the best check for "the frightful impersonality of the centrifugal forces that make for socialism."

(3) There is involved here also, in addition to the democratic method of approach, a proper philosophy of the human person. Scholastic psychology, as distinct from Platonism, will permit no complete divorce between the soul and the body. It is, therefore, an over-simplification to assign temporal aspects to the State and spiritual to the Church. Their interests necessarily overlap in the sense that the latter is concerned with physical health—witness, for example, the effects of Extreme Unction—and the former ought to be anxious to promote the virtues without which good citizenship is impossible. Besides, the body is the temple of the Holy Spirit. Therefore it is more than a matter of costs and organization. It is the spirit that vivifies. One thinks in this connection of Mr. Dooley's famous dictum: "Hinnissy, if the Christian Scientists had more science or the doctors more Christianity you'd be safe with either provided you had a good nurse." *Caritas Christi urget nos.* We must try to re-orient the present outlook more in terms of total well-being which includes the eternal. The surest curb for

the totalitarian potentials latent in so many contemporary movements is to stress anew the final indestructibility of the human person inherent in the true Christian notion of immortality.

MSGR. WILLIAM J. MCDONALD
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The Leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for February, 1900, is a lengthy review of a work by Fr. E. Dubois, C.SS.R., entitled *De Exemplarismo Divino.* The author of the review has given his article the heading: "A Recent Encyclopaedia of Theology." The purpose of the work in question is to point out that God, in the Trinity of Persons, is the efficient, exemplary and final cause of all reality. Fr. Siegfried praises the book highly, designating it as a "modern *Summa.*" . . . Fr. C. Coppens, S.J., defends an article which he had contributed to the December, 1899, issue, denouncing Freemasonry in the United States as hostile to the Catholic Church. He derives his information mostly from the writings of Albert Pike, whose life he summarizes in this present article. . . . This issue carries another instalment of *Luke Delmege,* from the pen of Canon Sheehan, of Ireland. . . . Fr. A. Kroll contributes an article in praise of the virtue of eutrapelia, intended to encourage especially among priests the spirit of gaiety and cheerfulness. . . . In the *Analecta* appears a letter from Pope Leo XIII to Msgr. William H. O'Connell, Rector of the American College in Rome, congratulating the College on its fortieth anniversary. . . . The Conference section contains a response of the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition, given in 1869 to the Archbishop of Quebec, and recently republished in the *Analecta Ecclesiastica.* He had asked if a previous decree, issued for England, requiring the integral confession of sins on the part of converts being rebaptized conditionally, was a universal law; and the answer was in the affirmative. . . . There is also a letter from an irate subscriber, complaining that a question he had submitted had not been answered after four months, and demanding that his name be taken from the roll of the subscribers. The editor's answer states that the *Review* gives no guarantee that all questions will be answered, either in print or by letter.

F. J. C.

RECENT DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

Undoubtedly, the most important and significant theological controversy that has arisen in recent years is that which centers around the relation between the natural and the supernatural. This controversy was occasioned by a book entitled *Surnaturel,* written by Fr. Henry de Lubac, S.J.[1] The work is intended primarily as an historical study of the meaning of the supernatural. Yet the author devotes considerable space to the explanation and the defense of his theological ideas. The fundamental theme of Fr. de Lubac is that the beatific vision, though it is supernatural, is the normal and only possible destiny of an intellectual being. Man can therefore have an absolute—not merely conditional—desire of supernatural beatitude as something to which his nature is destined. However, since *de facto* the attainment of this goal surpasses the natural powers of man, the desire of the beatific vision is inefficacious with respect to man's own abilities. But God freely grants man the means of arriving at his end, supernatural grace. Fr. de Lubac believes that in this manner the doctrine of the gratuity of grace is sufficiently safeguarded. A state of pure nature, in which man would be destined to a merely natural end he believes to be impossible. And he holds that this concept of the supernatural expresses the mind of St. Thomas and actually represents the true and traditional Catholic thought.

Confronted with the fact that the Church condemned certain propositions of Baius which seem to be identical with his denial of the possibility of a state of pure nature,[2] Fr. de Lubac contends that the error of Baius consisted in the theory that man in his primitive state of innocence was not dependent on the bounty of God, and had rights in commutative justice to supernatural gifts which God bestowed on him. There is no proposition in the list of those condemned by the Church, he says, whose contradictory asserts the possibility of an order in which man would have a purely natural end. It was the notion of a *debitum,* a strict obligation on the part of God toward man, that Pope Pius V condemned in the writings of Baius.

[1] *Études Historiques* (Paris: Aubier, 1946). Cf. *AER,* CXVII, 6 (June, 1947), 482.

[2] Cf. *DB,* 1021, 1023, 1024, 1026.

The most complete and most scholarly discussion of this theory which has appeared in the United States has been written by Fr. Philip Donnelly, S.J. His lengthy article in *Theological Studies* for June, 1948, deserves special notice. It consists in the presentation of a critique of the theory of Fr. de Lubac by Fr. de Blic, S.J., Fr. Boyer, S.J., and Fr. Donnelly himself.

Fr. de Blic[3] finds it impossible to subscribe to the main thesis of Fr. de Lubac. Far from appearing only in the sixteenth century, he claims, the current notion of the supernatural order is found in the writings of St. Thomas and of his contemporaries—the notion that the entire order of grace, including the beatific vision, is something not demanded by nature, so that consequently God could have destined man to a purely natural end. Furthermore, he asserts, the precise error condemned by Pope Pius V in the writings of Baius was the inseparability of the supernatural from nature, in the sense that the supernatural is the logical consequence of nature. Fr. de Blic admits that the argument of St. Thomas for man's need of the beatific vision to attain to perfect happiness[4] is concerned, not merely with the possibility of such a goal, but with its reality; however, he says, it was intended as an *ad hominem* argument against those who denied the transcendental beatitude of the supernatural order. When the Angelic Doctor was arguing, not apologetically, but from the standpoint of Catholic dogma, he asserted without hesitation that the beatific vision transcends all natural desires.

Fr. Boyer[5] also rejects the conclusions of Fr. de Lubac, and sees a contradiction in the concept of a nature which cannot have an end proportionate to itself but necessarily demands a higher end. He asserts that the concept of pure nature is by no means a recent invention of theologians, but on the contrary existed long before the Middle Ages, though the terminology for expressing it was not the same as it is today. He admits the possibility of a natural desire to see God, but this does not prove that the vision of God is actually destined for our final beatitude.

Fr. Donnelly himself finds his chief difficulty in the impossibility of reconciling the natural desire as absolute—that is, as something which cannot be frustrated—with the liberty of God. He says:

[3] *Mélanges de science religieuse*, IV (1947), 93 ff.

[4] Cf. *Sum. theol.*, I-II, q. 3, a. 8.

[5] *Gregorianum*, XXVIII (1947), 379 ff.

Fr. de Lubac stresses over and over again that divine liberty is the source of our desire for God and the fountainhead of the entire supernatural order. If this divine liberty is true liberty of indifference, then, despite all his denials a state of pure nature is completely possible. Unless Fr. de Lubac can demonstrate conclusively that the divine freedom which established the supernatural order is not a freedom of choice, but is rather an ineluctable and eternal decree allowing for no possible alternative destiny of men and angels, his entire theory must be considered unproved.[6]

It is difficult to see how one can hold Fr. de Lubac's theory without rejecting the idea of the supernatural that has been commonly accepted for centuries. Certainly his arguments are incapable of overthrowing the usual interpretation of the "natural desire to see God"—that such a desire is inefficacious and conditioned on God's free decree to elevate men to the supernatural order. By asserting that this desire is absolute and infrustrable, Fr. de Lubac seems to come logically to the conclusion that grace, as well as glory, is something that is due to man's nature. How, then, can grace be grace, that is, something gratuitous and supernatural?

The interest in the question as to the definability of Mary's corporeal assumption has produced a considerable number of theological discussions. In *L'Année théologique* for 1948, II-III, Fr. F. Cayré, A.A., writes on the first patristic witnesses to this privilege of the Blessed Virgin.[7] In the fourth century, he says, the main objective of Mariology was to defend the doctrine of Mary's inviolate virginity. However, we find some indications of the doctrine of the Assumption. The testimony of St. Epiphanius attributed to Mary the story found in the Apocalypse of the woman who escaped the dragon,[8] and saw in it an implication that she vanquished mortality.

Another witness from this same period is the presbyter Timothy of Jerusalem, who in a discourse pronounced on the feast of the Presentation attributed immortality to Mary, without declaring whether or not she had been dead for a brief time. Fr. Cayré infers from the manner in which this doctrine was preached in Jerusalem that it represented a teaching already known and accepted.

[6] *Theological Studies,* IX, 2 (June, 1948), 245.

[7] "Les premiers témoignages sur la doctrine de l'Assumption."

[8] *Apoc.* 12.

In the *Antonianum*, 1949, II-III, Fr. C. Balic, O.F.M., discusses the source of the doctrine of the Assumption in the deposit of faith.[9] He begins with the statement that practically all theologians believe this doctrine to be revealed, although they differ considerably as to the way in which this can be proved. He believes that in the event of an *ex cathedra* proclamation of this doctrine it will be stated, as factors of the teaching accepted by the Church, the Fathers and the theologians, that Mary died and subsequently was privileged with an anticipated resurrection; but that the definition itself will contain only the fact that her body, united to her soul, now exists gloriously in heaven.

Fr. Balic believes that the doctrine of the Assumption is not contained explicitly in divine tradition, nor can it be deduced with certainty from the Protoevangelium. He explains an argument proposed by Fr. C. Koser, O.F.M., who thinks that the Assumption of our Lady is contained implicitly in the second canon of the Council of Orange, which condemned those who assert that the sin of Adam brought only bodily death, not the death of the soul, on mankind.[10] Fr. Koser believes that this declaration of the Church indicates a necessary connection between sin and death, in such wise as to lead to the conclusion that one who has no sin will be assured of the gift of immortality. However this argument does not seem to Fr. Balic to be conclusive. He himself finds a convincing argument for the Assumption only in the universal acceptance of this doctrine by the official teachers of the Church, which suffices to render the doctrine definable, even though it could not be proved conclusively from any particular source. The definition of this doctrine he says, "will recall to the mind of the Catholic theologian that natural reason, with its critical investigations and its subtle analyses of the texts of Scripture and the Fathers is not always and in all the truths of faith taken individually sufficient *per se* to arrive at full certitude."[11]

L'Année théologique, 1949, I, contains an article on the Protoevangelium, by Fr. L. Sibum, A.A. He believes that *ipsum* should be substituted for *ipsa* in the Vulgate text: *Ipsa conteret caput tuum*. He states that the Bull *Ineffabilis*, defining the Immaculate

[9] "De Assumptione B.V. Mariae, quatenus in deposito fidei continetur."

[10] Cf. *DB*, 175.

[11] *Antonianum*, XXIV, 2-3 (April-June, 1949), 181.

Conception, while asserting that the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers saw in the Protoevangelium the declaration of a common enmity on the part of Jesus Christ and His Blessed Mother toward the devil, did not state that the Fathers saw in the text the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. It was the theologians of Pope Pius IX who made this deduction. To the objection that the Messianic interpretation of the Protoevangelium was not held unanimously by the Fathers—indeed, it would seem, this idea was unknown to the majority of the Fathers for the first six centuries—Fr. Sibum answers that, irrespective of the number of the Fathers who held that this text refers to the Redeemer and His Mother, the use that is made of it in the Bull *Ineffabilis* indicates that such is the sense of the prophecy. In making this affirmation the Church depends chiefly or even exclusively on the divine tradition which she ever maintains as something living, and of which we perceive only an echo in the Fathers and writers mentioned in the Bull. Fr. Sibum expresses the opinion that the *Ineffabilis* gave an authoritative interpretation of the Protoevangelium as referring to Jesus and Mary, though this is not a defined truth. Finally, he says, the Church has not declared whether it is in the literal or in the typical sense that the text refers to Mary, but has left this to the discussion of the exegetes.

An interesting opinion about the human knowledge of Christ is developed by Fr. A. Durand, S.J., in the *Nouvelle revue théologique* for May, 1949.[12] While admitting that our Lord had a knowledge of all actual things, past, present, and future, through the beatific vision which He enjoyed from the first moment of his conception,[13] Fr. Durand believes that this type of knowledge of itself could not be communicated to the lower plane of his intellect. For the act of the beatific vision is exercised without the aid of created species; whereas in the lower part of His intellect, Christ needed species in order to perform an act of knowledge. Hence the knowledge He possessed through the beatific vision could not be directly expressed in words. However, through infused species this higher knowledge could be indirectly communicated to the lower plane of intelligence. It was in this way that Christ perceived and expressed His own divinity and messiaship, and was able to make predictions concerning the future. It would be incongruous, however, to attribute

[12] "La science du Christ." [13] Cf. *DB*, 2183-85.

to our Lord in this lower plane of intelligence a knowledge of such things as calculus and music, since they in no wise contributed to the plan of the Redemption. Fr. Durand poses the question whether the knowledge of the day of judgment was communicated to the lower plane and pronounces it a matter of uncertainty. This explanation of the human knowledge of Christ, he believes, makes it possible for us to attribute to our Saviour the knowledge of all realities (in one plane of cognition) while admitting limitations to His intelligence (in another plane of knowledge).

In the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for January, 1949, Fr. Vincent Kerns, M.S.F.S., writes on "St. Francis de Sales and Original Sin." He tells us that the Saint adopted the "optimistic" view of the effects of original sin—that it deprived human nature, not of anything strictly due to it, but only of the supernatural and preternatural gifts given to Adam for transmission to his descendants. St. Francis chose this view, Fr. Kerns tells us, "partly out of veneration for its proponents, and partly because he had great faith in human nature, based on the fact that God, despite his foreknowledge of the fall, nevertheless still created man." Fr. Kerns also states that in asserting Mary's immunity from original sin, the Saint seems to have anticipated almost the identical wording of the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus.*

An entire book devoted to the treatment of the devil is something rare in Catholic literature. Such a work is the symposium (in French) *Satan,* the work of thirty-three writers.[14] The work is a study of the evil spirits from the standpoint of theology, Sacred Scripture, anthropology, psychiatry, exorcisms, etc. The sin of the angels is analyzed, and there is an interesting discussion on the possibility of sin by an angel in the purely natural order. The book also contains a treatment of the norms to be used in distinguishing true possession from pseudo-possession. Against the scepticism of today which smiles at the idea of evil spirits, the book begins with the assertion: "It is difficult to believe in Christ, the Redeemer, without believing also in His antagonist, the devil."

In the *Ephemerides Lovanienses* for January-April, 1949, Dom de Vooght, O.S.B., discusses an interesting but complicated problem in sacramental theology—the nature of the contrition required

[14] *Études Carmelitaines* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1948).

for the fruitful reception of the sacrament of Penance.[15] The author essays to present and to defend the opinion of St. Thomas. The Angelic Doctor, he contends, held that contrition based on charity is required for justification in the sacrament of Penance as well as for extra-sacramental justification. In the order of material causality, love for God and detestation of sin are necessary dispositions for justification, and in this order they can be called the cause of the infusion of grace. But in the order of efficient causality, they are the effects of grace. Now, since contrition is an element of the matter of the sacrament of Penance, it exercises a sacramental role in restoring the sinner to grace. In other words, as soon as the sinner elicits an act of contrition, the sacrament of Penance is already in operation, although he may go to confession and receive absolution only subsequently.

Dom Vooght believes that the dispute between the contritionists and the attritionists did much to obscure the theology of the sacrament of Penance. For, the idea of contrition which arose in consequence of this discussion is different from that which was in the mind of St. Thomas. St. Thomas regarded contrition based on love as united to the detestation of sin. Dom Vooght adds: "If a person regrets the offense, he already loves the one he has offended. If it were admitted that to detest sin is already to love, a great step would be taken, since all would then recognize that the sinner, even though he remains attrite, must at least turn away from his sin, as sin."

In the same issue of the *Ephemerides Lovanienses* Fr. L. Ceyssens, O.F.M., relates the historical background of the decree issued by the Holy Office on May 5, 1667, concerning the controversy which was then being hotly waged between the Contritionists and the Attritionists. The decree commanded that until the Holy See had issued a decision in this matter, neither side should denounce the opposite opinion with a theological censure or apply to it unjust or insulting terms.[16] The chief field of the controversy was Belgium. It was Msgr. Rospigliosi, the papal internuncio at Brussels, who pleaded with the Roman authorities that the matter be taken up by the Holy Office. Pope Alexander VII himself, only a few weeks before his death, commanded that the Holy Office should carefully study the controverted matter and take opportune meas-

[15] "La théologie de la pénitence." [16] Cf. *DB*, 1146.

ures. Although no definite decision was given, a limited approval was given to the view of the attritionists by the statement of the decree that this was the more common teaching of the scholastics.

In the *Clergy Review* for October, 1949, Fr. Clifford Howell, S.J., asks for a more expressive participation in the sacrifice of the Mass on the part of the faithful, especially those who are to receive Holy Communion.[17] He emphasizes the statement of Pope Pius XII, in *Mediator Dei,* to the effect that they are to be praised for their piety "who not only desire to be nourished with the heavenly food when they are present at the Sacrifice, but prefer to be fed with hosts consecrated at the same sacrifice." Fr. Howell suggests, not only that the faithful be communicated from a ciborium consecrated at the same Mass, but even that, as far as possible, they themselves present the hosts. He admits the difficulties attendant on this plan in the case of Sunday Mass, when so many receive Holy Communion, but he believes that it could be put into operation on a weekday when only a small number approach the communion rail. He suggests that this be done by a kind of offertory procession, and states that such a ceremony is actually taking place in some churches. The method he favors is this:

> On a small table at the sanctuary gates let there be a tray on which rest an empty ciborium, a box of small hosts, a pair of sugar-tongs or forceps and the cruets. While the priest is reading the Offertory verse, intending communicants could approach the table and each would transfer a host from box to ciborium. The server bears the tray to the celebrant, who takes from it the ciborium and puts it on the corporal, then carrying on with the "Suscipe" in the normal way.[18]

It is interesting to note that the August issue of the same periodical had carried a statement from the pen of Canon Edward Mahoney, to the effect that the custom which Fr. Howell later described "is not permitted, because it is an unauthorized interruption of the Mass, and because the rubric in *Rit. Celebr. Miss.,* II, 3, clearly directs the hosts for the communion of the faithful to be on the corporal from the beginning of the Mass." However, Canon Mahoney continues, an indult to permit an Offertory procession might be obtained, and he asserts that he cannot say whether or

[17] "Sharing in the Sacrifice."
[18] *The Clergy Review,* XXXII, 4 (Oct. 1949), 236.

not such an indult has been obtained in those places where the ceremony is now being conducted.[19]

A summary account of a problem that was discussed at great length several centuries ago is contained in an article by Fr. W. Ullmann in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for February, 1949, entitled "Medieval Views Concerning Papal Abdication." The author relates that in the Middle Ages a large number of scholars believed that the consecration of a Pope confers on him an indelible character. Moreover, they argued, the papacy involves a kind of spiritual marriage of the successor of Peter with the universal Church, and the bond of marriage is indissoluble. Those who held the opposite view argued that the papal office confers no character, since in the matter of sacerdotal functions the Pope is not superior to other bishops. The distinctive factor of the papal office is jurisdictional, and jurisdiction can be diminished and even lost. The bond between the Pope and the faithful subject to his authority can be regarded as a kind of spiritual marriage; but a spiritual marriage, unlike a carnal marriage, can be dissolved for the common good, by an authoritative decision, as is done when a bishop is transferred from his diocese. In the case of the Pope's renunciation, the authoritative declaration of the dissolution of the bond comes from himself. As Fr. Ullmann points out, this second view is now accepted in the Church's Canon Law.[20]

The Lambeth Council of 1948, attended by 329 Anglican Bishops, is the occasion for articles by Fr. Humphrey Johnson in the *Clergy Review* for August, 1948, and by Fr. J. Good in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for May, 1949. Fr. Johnson's article, which is a summary account of the Anglican Church since the Tractarian movement, points to the main weakness of this communion at the present day, when it states:

> While Anglicans still pray for deliverance from "all false doctrine, heresy, and schism," these words have lost their old meaning. . . . Liberalism, like Ritualism, has now gained a secure foothold in the Church of England. Yet, the hopes of its fervent advocates have not been realized. The belief that cultivated men were being alienated from the Church of England by too rigid doctrinal formulae and that this

---

[19] *The Clergy Review*, XXXII, 2 (Aug. 1949), 125.

[20] Canon 221.

alienation would cease if there were a relaxation of doctrinal standards has not been realized. Comprehension, once a source of strength to the Church of England, has now become a source of weakness.[21]

Fr. Good relates that the Committee on Unity which reported to the Council seemed surprised that Pope Pius XI, in 1928, made it clear that submission to the papacy is the first condition of unity, and seemed further surprised that there are no signs whatever of any abatement of this demand in the last twenty years. Quite naturally the Committee concluded that the prospects of intercommunion (with the Catholic Church) are unpromising for the present. Fr. Good concludes: "The Lambeth Report of 1948 is a sad commentary on the churches of the Anglican communion. It is a series of doubts, concessions and inconsistencies, and the word 'Comprehensiveness' is put forward as the solution of all difficulties. . . . It used to be disputed whether the Church of England still retained its catholicity of dogma at the death of Henry VIII. We are confident today that its dogma is non-existent."[22]

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[21] *The Clergy Review*, XXX, 2 (Aug. 1948), 84.

[22] *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Fifth Series, LXXI, n. 977 (May 1949), 414.

BISHOP SHAHAN ON THE PRIESTHOOD

The world is girdled with holy altars, at whose edge stands an army of priests, chosen for the unbloody but saving immolation of the Lamb. And between them all, and between them and the Lamb, there is a divine solidarity of office. Whatever they may be worth as men, whatever be the insignia of rank and authority, they are all public agents of the Savior, constituted for all men, for all their needs and hopes; constituted forever in the sight of all men, leaders like Moses, priests like Aaron, prophets like David,—nay, themselves daily, in one sublime hour, the symbols and the vicars of Christ in His Passion, Death, and Resurrection.

—Bishop Shahan, in "The Office of the Priesthood," printed in *The Catholic University Bulletin*, July, 1900, p. 296.

THE "CATHOLIC" VIEWPOINT ON INDUSTRY COUNCILS

For the past fifteen years or so, literally thousands of Catholic speakers and writers have been stirring up the millions to consider seriously the contents of the encyclical, *Quadragesimo anno.* We have been boasting that the real answer to our economic problems will be found in the pages of any five-cent pamphlet carrying the message. We have been challenging the world to forsake the social framework within which it has been operating and adopt the principles put forth by the Vatican.

Before we go much further and find ourselves trying to defend a position that may cause us embarrassment, it might be well to take stock and determine what this social doctrine of ours really means and what may be some of the logical consequences.

The underlying thought of the Vocational Group concept is that the workers be organized into their own unions, in each industry; employers be organized into their own freely chosen associations and that the public (presumably to be represented by government) joins with the other two parties in forming Industrial Councils, dedicated to the common good, to work for mutual objectives harmoniously agreed upon by the representatives of all three parties.

Technically, the scope of the Vocational Group extends beyond the limited sphere of industrial life. The popular terminology of "Industrial Councils," however, has been accepted by the Administrative Board of the Welfare Council of the American Hierarchy. We use the term in the sense expressed by the Bishops' Committee in its annual messages.

The purpose of this present article is to create discussion on the subject with the hope that a clarification of some points may result.

It is the opinion of the writer that the Vocational Group concept of industrial society is basic to the doctrine expressed in the encyclical. We do not believe, however, that it is meant to be a blueprint for any one, definite, form of economy. There are no hard and fast lines drawn which must be followed.

Salvo meliore judicio, it is our contention that the teaching contained in *Quadragesimo anno* is a *declaration of principles* which outlines the *nature of industrial society* when it has developed to such a stage that some definite *order* must be established. It indi-

cates the *proper relationships* which must prevail between the parties involved if *stability* is to be maintained. It is not concerned so much with the participation of individuals in industrial relation negotiations, but rather points out how a *properly functioning economy* fits into the pattern of a *properly functioning political order.*

Some have objected to what they call the "monopoly feature" of the Vocational Group set-up. Others insist that the papal proposal is but *one* way of achieving an economic order. Neither dissent seems valid to us.

The first objection, we believe, is based on the assumption that the doctrine of the Vocational Group philosophy and the specific "syndicate" structure cited are one and the same thing. We do not think that they are.

The two topics are treated separately. The first deals with principles. The second merely calls attention to an experiment. The reference, evidently, is to Mussolini's attempt at an ordered industrial society. The Pope admits that certain features of the plan are commendable, but we fail to see a complete "placet" for the plan in the passage. To identify these two sections of the encyclical seems to us a grand mistake.

Ultimately, a *definite* social framework will result from the acceptance and application of the principle. A "plan" must be evolved from it. But *in itself* it can not be so labelled. *The Form is to be determined by the participants.* As the Pope writes: "It is hardly necessary to note that what Leo XIII taught concerning the form of political government can, in due measure, be applied also to vocational groups. Here, too, men may choose whatever form they please, provided both justice and the common good be taken into account."[1]

On the other hand, we do not concur in the opinion that the Vocational Group doctrine is merely a suggestion of *one way* of achieving an economic order. The papal plea does not make any sense to us except on the basis that it lays down the *principles* which must be followed *regardless of what form the practical set-up* is to take when they are applied.

If this conclusion be correct, it places upon us the social obligation to promote the Industry Council concept as the unique and

[1] Cf. the translation of *Quadragesimo anno* in Nell-Breuning's *Reorganization of Social Economy*, p. 424.

Catholic viewpoint for the complete and adequate restoration of industrial society. It implies a rejection of the *status quo* unless it can be shown that our present economy operates on principles that are consistent with and not contrary to the papal doctrine. It is the contention of the writer that the two are not compatible.

The insistence of the encyclical is on the re-establishment of a Vocational Group society. The chief qualifications of those vocational groups or guilds, as noted by Pius XI, are that they

are autonomous;
embrace whole industries and professions;
are federated with other constituent groups;
possess the right of free organization,
assembly,
and vote;
that they should dedicate themselves to the common good,
and with *governmental protection and assistance function in the establishment of justice and the general welfare in economic life.*

Study that outline and see if you can reconcile it with what today goes by the name of Modern American Capitalism.

It is assumed, and the propoganda on the subject is profuse indeed, that our American economy is one of free enterprise. Often times there are as many meanings given to the words as there are men who proclaim them. Usually what is meant is that, allowed to function without interference, the action and reaction of supply and demand will, through competition, result in a balanced and just distribution of the fruits of production.

Rev. Raymond McGowan, in one of his syndicated articles pointed out quite clearly that we do not have in America any one unified economic system. It is rather a conglomeration, a hodge-podge of different and often conflicting applications of a variety of principles. There is monopoly and near-monopoly, and the lack of the same. There is government regulation of some industries and the lack of it in others. There are restrictions by law upon some parts of the economy and a contrary policy adopted toward other segments. There is evidence even of free enterprise but not much that is not affected in one way or another by the overshadowing influence of Big Business.

Describe the modern capitalistic "system" as you will, we fail to see how it corresponds in any way to the concept of industrial society put forth in the encyclical, *Quadragesimo anno*.

Aside from the isolated cases of varied co-operative enterprises which you may find, the system as a "system" seems to us to be a negation of the papal teaching.

Where is there any similarity between the Big Business economic set-up now prevailing in America, with its concomitant class-warfare, and the *Order* of industrial society demanded by our Catholic social doctrine?

It is the contention of the writer that we must accept this doctrine of the Church and follow it to its logical conclusion or cease pretending that there is a Catholic position on the subject.

The logical conclusion involves: (1) A repudiation of the status quo; (2) the frank admission that the Church advocates a *limited planned economy;* and (3) a courageous teaching of the subject on the same plane that we preach our doctrine on marriage, education, etc. regardless of popular reaction to the subject.

The question is not: "Can we convince a prejudiced world that this is the correct concept of industrial society?" The real issue is: "What is the meaning of the papal pronouncements and are we going to accept or reject them?"

Our present economic system violates fundamental principles which the Pope insists are necessary for a sound social order. It ignores the very nature of industrial society.

The first basic principle which our Management-Finance controlled economy ignores or violates is the *Principle of Subsidiarity.* The whole concept of the Industry Council philosophy is based on this principle. The primary demand of this principle is that no higher and greater authority should usurp functions that belong to a lesser society.

Capitalism, as it has developed, provides no means for its participants to act upon the principle of subsidiarity. Pushing its burdens back upon the political arm of the government, it has encouraged the State to intrude and encroach upon areas of economic life that rightly belong to private enterprise. The result has been a hybrid mixture of socially unstable institutions as Fr. McGowan has indicated, and the establishment of an economic "system" which

can not be defended by any one who accepts the Christian social doctrine.

Even a cursory examination of *Quadragesimo anno* should convince us of the futility of attempting to defend the so-called principle of "free" enterprise. The need of repudiating it is inescapable.

In *Quadragesimo anno* Pius remarked: "Free competition, though within certain limits just and productive of good results, cannot be the *ruling principle* of the economic world. . . . Still less can this function be exercised by the economic supremacy *which within recent times has taken the place of free competition.*"[2] A little later he says: "Free competition is dead; economic dictatorship has taken its place."[3] Previously the indictment read: "This accumulation of power, the *characteristic note* of the modern economic order, is a natural result of limitless, free competition which permits the survival of those only who are the strongest, which often means those who fight most relentlessly, who pay least heed to the dictates of conscience."[4]

These, of course, are but random references to the popular economic error of an "automatic" industrial order based upon a policy of "free" enterprise as a guide and governor of an economy. But, put even these few pieces together, study them in the light of the tremendous economic power now wielded by a relatively few giant corporations as revealed in reports of the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1938 and the task of reconciling American Capitalism with papal social doctrine becomes well nigh an impossibility.

We have been so immersed in our own capitalistic environment, our pattern of thought has been so moulded by the atmosphere in which we have lived that it is difficult for us to envision any other. His Holiness, Pius XI, however, from his vantage point on Vatican Hill is encumbered by none of the prejudicial influences which might sway our thinking.

The encyclical presents papal thought on the subject of industrial society with pointed insistency. And rightly so, we believe, because to a world infatuated with Individualism and tortured by a love of its own patched-up disorders, the Church is publicizing what the *real nature of industrial society* actually is. "For *as nature induces* those who dwell in close proximity to unite into municipali-

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 424-25. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 428. [4] *Ibid.*

ties," says Pius XI, "so those who practice the same trade or profession, economic or otherwise, combine into *vocational groups.* These groups, *in a true sense autonomous,* are considered by many to be, if not essential to civil society, at least its *natural and spontaneous development.*"[5]

From this passage the noted interpreter of *Quadragesimo anno* concludes that the union of citizens in civil society and the union of members in the Vocational Groups "appear *natural* to the Pope."[6]

The Bishops' Committee in its 1947 annual message said: "The *Christian* view of economic life *supports the demand for* organization of management, labor, agriculture and the professions under government encouragement but not control, in *joint* effort to avoid social conflict and to promote cooperation for the common good." Pius XI, by analogy, likens the *inducement of nature* toward Industrial Councils to that of citizens to form civil society. The Bishops put it down as the *Christian* view of economic life.

If we understand the papal analogy correctly, Pius is telling us that the idea is not *so essential* that it will be found even in primitive society or in a pioneer industrial world. But as civil society is formed, grows and develops into an ordered and stable State, *so, too must industrial society grow as a social organism*—and for the same reason. The very nature of human society dictates the course of action.

How strong that sanction of nature is or under what specific phase of the natural law it falls, the writer confesses that he does not know at the present time. But that Pius XI puts it in these terms is unmistakable and that Nell-Breuning, the classic interpreter of the encyclical, infers that the Vocational Groups *represent the natural status of a highly developed industrial society* cannot be gainsaid.

In confirmation of that premise might we not also ask the question: "If the Industry Council relationship of capital and labor is not rooted in nature in some way, before there is any thought of a practical application, on what basis can '*autonomy*' be claimed for the groups?" It is in dealing with this idea of industrial "autonomy" and the relationship that it has to the State that the note of insistence comes out clearly:

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 423.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 222.

Just as it is wrong to withdraw from the individual and commit to the community at large what private enterprise and industry can accomplish, so too it is an injustice, a grave evil and a disturbance of right order for a larger and higher organization to arrogate to itself functions which can be performed efficiently by smaller and lower bodies. This is a fundamental principle [The Principle of Subsidiarity] of social philosophy, unshaken and unchangeable, and it retains its full truth today.[7]

The Sovereign Pontiff then remarks: "The aim of social legislation must therefore be the *re-establishment of vocational groups.*"[8] The Outline Press translation by Dr. Francis Brown reads: "The social policy of the State must be the re-establishment of the Professions and Industries." *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* June 1, 1931, gives us the original text: "In reficiendos igitur 'ordines,' ars politica socialis incumbat necesse est."

If this concept does not correspond to the "natural and spontaneous development" of civil society, as the encyclical states, and is not so rooted in the very nature of society as to demand a juridical (autonomous) order of its own, why should papal authority so bluntly place the burden of establishing such an order upon the State? Why does Pius link the nature of vocational group society so closely to the nature of the State itself? To our mind, the development of the argument reveals the real nature of industrial society. Nor is it merely an empty, "up in the clouds" expression of a half-formed opinion. It is pregnant with practical significance. It is loaded with social dynamite.

The repudiation of our hybrid "free," monopolistic, government-regulated Capitalism flows directly from the acceptance of the principle of the Vocational Group concept of industrial society. The two are incompatible. If we were to be content merely with a negative attitude of refusing assent to our present system, nothing more than mild resentment might follow. It is when we draw out the doctrine to its logical conclusion that the repercussions come fast and hard.

Carry the contrast of the two philosophies to its logical conclusion and you begin to understand why the immediate and spontaneous reaction to the Catholic viewpoint is frequently one of opposition. If we merely enunciate the principle on the high plane of theory alone (on a plane so removed from reality that it appears

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 422.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 428.

but a vague and illusory ideal), few protests are heard. Reduce it to the level of a practical solution put forth to supplant the disordered conflict and confusion now prevailing, and a roar breaks forth as the listener perceives the gash that is inflicted upon his prejudices.

The reason for the pained expressions and the howl of dismay is not hard to find. This truly radical and daringly different doctrine of the Church runs counter to Modern Capitalism as it has developed in structure and operation. It brings us face to face with the challenge of accepting the papal doctrine and rejecting the modern economic order or shunting the encyclical aside as a weakly-expressed suggestion and complacently conforming our convictions to things as they are.

We maintain that the Industrial Council principle is not in itself a formal, detailed "plan." But the acceptance of the premise leads directly to the necessity on the part of the participants in industrial relations to establish the "form" that the economy will take.

When the Bishops' Committee in its 1948 message says, "Co-operation must be organized; freedom must be ordered," we do not believe that they are using the words metaphorically. They are calling for a realignment of relationships between Capital and Labor which differs from what we have at present. The three participants are to be Capital, Labor, and the Public.

You can not "organize" *co-operation* without establishing a social framework within which the co-operation is to take place. The Industrial Council set-up is to be the framework. You can not *"order"* freedom without placing limitations on the activities of the individual. Nor can you place limitations upon three participating parties without introducing some kind of an agency in which will reside *social authority*.

The content of this organizing and ordering is not some nebulous, negative, vague, or illusory plea for co-operation in general. The objectives are of the stuff that industrial relations are made of—wages, prices, profits, production—the vital elements around which the class struggle now revolves.

As a matter of fact it is at this focal point that the full meaning of the encyclical is revealed. It is here that the Vocational Group concept comes to grips with the contentions of the Free Enterprise Individualists.

Pius expresses the warning in rather strong language. He says:

> Labor, indeed, is not a mere chattel, since the human dignity of the workingman must be recognized in it, and consequently it cannot be bought and sold like any piece of machinery. None the less, the demand and supply of labor divides men on the labor market into two classes, as into two camps, and the *bargaining* between these two parties transforms the labor market into an arena where the two armies are engaged in combat. To this *grave disorder,* which is leading society to ruin, *a remedy must be applied as speedily as possible.* But there can not be question of any perfect cure, except this opposition be done away with, and well-ordered members of the social body come into being anew, *vocational groups namely,* binding men together not according to the position they occupy on the labor market, but according to the diverse functions which they exercise in society.[9]

By the application of the formula of two plus two equals four, what the Pope is saying is this: Bargaining over wages (and the equivalent of wages) transforms the so-called labor market into an arena. The cause of the class conflict must be eliminated. The only way this can be done is by an agency to persuade the two parties to accept an *objective standard* or by a social authority superior to the conflicting parties which will determine a human wage on a principle of justice and in the full light of the common good. The Vocational Group set-up provides for either alternative.

Wages, however, are not absolutes. They are relatives. Their value is necessarily related to prices and production. If you are to eliminate wages from the competitive area of the labor market, so too must prices and production and co-related elements fall under the jurisdiction of the social authority delegated to deal with the problem.

This does not mean a "totalitarian" control of the industrial world. It certainly does not envision complete government control or the relinquishing of the right of private property. It entails an autonomous regulation of the economic order by the management-labor participants themselves. As much of industrial relations must be placed under restriction as is needed to establish *order,* to guarantee *stability* and *to protect the public welfare.* Competition is not outlawed. But it is constrained and confined to definite channels of operation.

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 423.

Unlimited competition is nothing more than the law of the jungle applied to economics. State strictures on the practices of competition gradually can grow into a creeping Socialism.

It is perfectly evident, nevertheless, if you wish to avoid State control and you rule out "no control," there can be but one basis for Order—namely a self-regulated industrial society. That is the final aim of the Church's doctrine. Nothing else makes sense. A human society devoid of authority and order is a contradiction. It is anarchy no matter what other name you might try to give it.

A possible misconception must be anticipated and avoided. It is not as though the encyclical envisions the "mobilizing" of the millions from some far distant place to live and work under a new order by organizing and ordering them into a society alien from what they now know. *The groups are already there. They exist.* Inchoative in some instances; more fully developed in others. But the industries—steel, rubber, textile, auto, communications, etc., by their very existence and the common bond of producing and distributing the same kind of goods which links the parties together—*are already functioning* as social entities. It is in their *functioning,* however, on a *class-warfare principle* as they do at present, that the *natural* relationships have gone awry.

What the Church purposes to do is to *reorientate* the objectives of the participating parties toward the mutual goal of the common good and *to realign the relationships* so that the *proper representation* can be exercised by the three essential partners.

If we are to compete in the arena of public opinion with the Communists and Socialists on the left and propaganda agencies like the National Association of Manufacturers on the right, we must boldly proclaim our doctrine.

In publicizing the Catholic position on industrial society we have, it seems to us, but one of three choices. We can support:

(1) The *status quo,* which is in reality an implicit acceptance of laissez faire as the original principle of the present economy and of its natural consequent, monopoly; it condones *increasing government control* to curb abuses rather than self-regulation as the corrective.

(2) Complete government control, which, of course, is contrary to all that we hold.

(3) The promotion of Industrial Councils on all possible levels, culminating in a *social authority,* autonomous, but within the framework of the political democracy.

We believe the first possibility must be rejected. Despite the comparable advantages of Modern Capitalism in contrast with other existing economies and certain oases of order in the vast desert of economic disorder, we have yet to discover a positive principle of social order to justify it *as a whole.*

If the Industry Council principle represents the *natural* state of industrial society we do not see how one can condone the capitalistic *status quo* any more than one might approve of divorce as normal to domestic society, or aggression and anarchy to civil society.

In origin, the capitalistic *status quo* defies the papal denunciation of free competition as a guiding principle for economic life; the Bishops' Committee, in its 1940 annual message has passed judgment upon it as "predicated on false principles." In its present structure and operation it repudiates the principle of subsidiarity and runs counter to the exhortation of Pius that the "social policy of the State must be the re-establishment of vocational groups."[10] The mongrel mixture of unilateral monopolistic private enterprise and a constantly encroaching government interference contradicts the encyclical teaching on the nature of both Industry and the State.

The second supposition stands self-condemned in the simple stating of its terms.

The third of the three choices enumerated is the only one which can be logically and consistently accepted in the light of the encyclical teaching on Vocational groups. (Profit-sharing and other piecemeal solutions offer no provision to date for the integrating of the disparate but interdependent activities that must be co-ordinated. They are a step in the right direction toward the papal goal. They are not, however, the adequate answer to the problem.)

Once you grant the inevitable conclusion of a *natural* Industry Council economic order you must reject the unilateral domination of industrial society. The relationship of the three parties (management, labor, and government) then must be determined. This

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 422.

is a challenge to our Catholic philosophers which lays out a whole world of research before them.

The taunting query pops up immediately, "What are the specific rights and duties of the participating groups?"

To some, the difficulties inherent in answering that question are overwhelming. Perhaps they are. The limitations of the human intellect on the point, however, do not give us the right to deny, distort or disregard the original premise from which the question naturally flows.

Some tell us that we must first determine the "efficiency" and "workability" of our doctrine before we strenuously advocate it in public. Others shy away from it lest it be not adaptable to American circumstances or prove unacceptable even to prominent capitalists, whose "dogmatic" Catholic lives may be beyond reproach.

We do not recognize this attitude as the traditional procedure among Catholic students. It is not the normal approach to other subjects whose content is derived from right reason and which involves moral implications. Why introduce an innovation in the field of human relations in the economic world?

Many individuals consider divorce as a more "efficient" answer to their problem than monogamy. You will find educators who ridicule the Catholic viewpoint on education. They tell us it is neither practically "adaptable" to American circumstances nor acceptable to the experts in the field of education.

O. Henry, in one of his delightful quips on the foibles of human fancy, remarks, "Tobin was always looking for the 'unnatural' in nature." It may be all very well for O. Henry's Mr. Tobin to seek out the "unnatural" in nature if that be what his avocation in life calls for. The Catholic philosopher and sociologist, however, devotes his time and talent to exactly the opposite viewpoint. His desire is to seek out the "natural" in nature and to reveal his findings to his fellow men.

So intent are we in making known the nature of man and the natural relationships which should exist among men that the Popes have not hesitated to issue encyclicals, the source of whose truth is not based on revelation alone. Whole sections of the social doctrine appeal for their cogency not upon any dogmatic pro-

nouncement but upon truths which can be deduced by natural reasoning.

So intimately are the two sources, revelation and right reason, linked that it is quite common to speak of the "Catholic" attitude on some issue or subject even though there is no direct dogmatic basis for the position.

The Vocational Group concept of industrial society, is, we believe, one of those deductions. In the treatment and teaching of the subject, we do not believe that we have any right to look at it merely in the light of how a prejudiced public may react to it. Many practical men, experienced in the field, attest that this is the economic order of the future, if there is to be any free economic order in the years to come. Our present-day students and seminarians are the leaders of the future. Is there any mandate in Catholic teaching that demands that we be always twenty-five years behind the times and the teachings of the Vatican?

The Church is not responsible for either the rise or the development of Modern Capitalism. She has no divine commission to defend it. She may suffer concomitant material losses if the system collapses. But regardless of the present or the future of the "paradise of free enterprise," we still have the duty to promote our own teaching. It is our conviction that we can do so without fear of fallacy, in either the economic or the moral order, because the doctrine has a firm foundation in the natural relationships which should prevail in a properly ordered industrial society.

Quadragesimo anno is twenty-five, perhaps fifty years, in advance of the present generation. The refusal or reluctance of Catholics to study and spread the doctrine, however, will not lessen the time span for its acceptance.

The Socialists of fifty years ago were in a similar position. Their pioneer efforts of propaganda are today paying dividends. If we allow our opportunities to be lost by default, Socialism or Communism will inevitably hold the place in the future which we will have abdicated by indifference to our own doctrine. The very condition of our present economy makes that conclusion appear to be a certainty. If we wish to contribute to the defeat of Socialism twenty-five years from now, we will proclaim our own teaching today.

The one obstacle that stands in the way is that which Pius XI

remarked in the opening pages of *Quadragesimo anno,* as he commented upon the popular reaction to the original Leonine pronouncement. It "was so far and so unexpectedly in advance of its time," lamented Pius, "that the slow of heart ridiculed the study of the new social philosophy, and the timid feared to scale its lofty heights."

Pius himself, however, was undeterred. He went right ahead and wrote another encyclical, this time boldly championing the principle of a vocational group society. It is inconceivable that the Pope struggled to bring forth this immortal message merely as practice in penmanship.

WILLIAM J. SMITH, S.J.

Crown Heights Associated Activities
Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE PERPETUAL INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH

As the unity [of the Church] is perpetual, so is the infallibility. Once infallible, always infallible: in the first, in the fifth, in the fifteenth, in the nineteenth century: the Divine Teacher always present, and the organ of His voice always the same. A truncated infallibility is impossible. To affirm that it has been suspended because of the sins of men, denies the perpetuity of the office of the Holy Ghost, and even of His presence; for to suppose Him present but dormant, is open to the reproach of Elias; to suppose His office to be suspended, is to conceive of the Divine Teacher after the manner of men. And further: this theory denies altogether the true and divine character of the mystical body as a creation of God, distinct from all individuals, and superior to them all: not on probation, because not dependent upon any human will, but on the Divine will alone; and, therefore, not subject to human infirmity, but impeccable, and the instrument of probation to the world.

—Cardinal Manning, in *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost* (New York, 1875), pp. 88 f.

CAESAROPAPISM IN ACTION

Great names appear on the list of those who have fought for the independence of the Church, for the primacy of the spiritual over the material. Athanasius, Basil, John Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Augustine are but a few of the noble men who in the course of their lives have striven to make certain that the members of the Church which Christ founded might enjoy the freedom which was rightfully theirs as the children of God. Each in his own way, in his own time and place, met the challenge of powers which would have subjugated the Church to their own selfish interests; and each for the time, at least, with the help of God promised to those who work for his interests, turned back the onslaught of those powers. Others might or might not in their turn do as much, but these champions won their combats in their day.

Thus, when the Arian bishops, defeated at Nicea and still protesting that decision, cast about for support outside the Church which had decided against them they betook themselves to the court of the Emperor at Constantinople. The aging Constantine fell, to some extent, under their influence and ordered Athanasius, the youthful successor of Alexander at Alexandria, who had fought so strenuously against Arius, to receive him once more into his communion. Careful as he had been, from the time he joined forces with the Christians, not to interfere in matters ecclesiastical, the Roman Emperor, with the long tradition of sovereignty over religion as well as civil affairs behind him and with a preoccupation to preserve the peace of his realm at all costs, did not hesitate to tell the bishop of Alexandria whom he should admit to his communion, regardless of the decision taken at Nicea.

Athanasius, unable to accede to the command of the temporal power in a matter such as this, refused to receive Arius and was promptly sent into exile at Trier in the northwest territories of the Empire. Constantine, however, contented himself with meting out this punishment to a recalcitrant bishop and did not proceed, as his son did later, to put another "bishop" in Athanasius' place. By 337, therefore, the new emperors, adopting a changed attitude, could permit Athanasius to return to his see where he proceeded to rally round him the bishops and monks of Egypt.

Not so easily, however, were the bishops of the Arian party to be put aside. Once again they gathered round the Emperor of the East, finding this time even more favor than with Constantine. Constantius II, more inclined than his father to give expression to the Roman tradition that the head of the state was also head of the religion of the state, was only too happy to find a group of churchmen who acknowledged his supremacy in matters spiritual by having recourse to him when a dispute of that nature arose.

Once again the acts of the Synod of Tyre (335), which had condemned Athanasius on the basis of reports collected in Egypt by a commission composed of his enemies, were dragged out and made to serve their intended purpose, the deposition of the bishop of Alexandria. This time, however, the Arians seem to have been not yet too sure of their power over Constantius, for they sent the acts of Tyre to Pope Julius I at Rome to have his support, as well as that of the Emperor, against the Patriarch of Egypt. Sensing, however, from the fact that the Pope called a council of one hundred bishops at Rome to consider the matter, that his decision might not be favorable to them, the Arians did not wait for the decision and in 339 installed by force at Alexandria a bishop selected by them, contrary to all the canons, Gregory of Cappadocia.

Athanasius, condemned once more to depart from his see, betook himself to Rome where in 341 the council pronounced him innocent. This, however, did not suffice to open the way for him to return at once to Alexandria. Constans, the brother of Constantius and the ruler in the West, finally intervened, in the hope of restoring peace in the Empire, and at last succeeded in having a council held at Sardica (343). Elusive peace, however, still did not come. More pressure upon his brother was exerted by Constans, but not until the death of the intruder, Gregory of Cappadocia, was Athanasius able to return (346).

With the death of Constans (350) and of Pope Julius I (352) the Arian party once more took heart and began again to filter in around the Emperor, Constantius, and the new Pope, Liberius. To this new Pope, Athanasius sent Serapion of Thmuis to defend him. Liberius, for his part, suggested to the Emperor that a council be convoked to decide once and for all these questions of personalities.

The Emperor accepted the suggestion, but imposed the condemnation of Athanasius upon the council of Arles (353) and that of Milan (355). In the end, he went so far as to replace Athanasius with another intruder, George of Cappadocia (357) and the bishop of Alexandria was forced once more to take flight, this time into the desert. There for six years, helped by the monks, he eluded the bands of imperial soldiers sent out to capture him and governed the Church of Egypt as its "invisible patriarch," leading the resistance to the temporal power with an energy and a force felt even to the western fringes of the Empire.

It is in Athanasius' "History of the Arians," written for the monks of Egypt at this time, that he asserts forcefully the independence of the Church against the Caesaropapism of Constantius II which had engulfed almost the entire East. Here we find a clear statement of the primacy of the spiritual as against the encroachments of the temporal power which seeks to subjugate it.

Constantius, according to Athanasius,[1] did not hesitate to penetrate even into the "holy places." This was not merely encroachment in the sense of political, social, or juridical harassments, but encroachment in the sense of actual physical violence. When Constantius struck at Athanasius by ordering the prefect of Egypt to distribute grain only to the Arians and not to those of the faithful who were in communion with Athanasius, indicating his low regard for the Archbishop of Alexandria,[2] it was but the first blow.

In the summer of 355 he sent the imperial *notarius,* Diogenes, to Alexandria, charged with the mission to drive Athanasius out completely. The people, however, resisted this move, as did the officials, and after some four months of maneuverings Diogenes had to abandon his plans.[3]

Hilarius, another *notarius,* then came to try his hand, accompanied by the *dux* Syrianus and a troop of over five thousand picked from the legions of Libya and Egypt. On the night of Feb. 8, 356, the soldiers surrounded the church of St. Theonas, where Athanasius was presiding at the services, a vigil. Armed with drawn swords, bows, javelins, and clubs, they broke down the doors of

[1] Cf. St. Anthanasius, *Historia arianorum,* c. 77; *MPG,* XXV, 785.

[2] Cf. *Hist. ar.,* c. 31; *MPG,* XXV, 728.

[3] Cf. *Historia acephala,* c. 4, ed. P. Batiffol in *Melanges de Cabrières,* tom. I, 100 ff.

the church and invaded it. Athanasius, having tried to calm the crowd of worshippers, and making no attempt at resistance, fled. The mission of Hilarius was thus accomplished. The churches of Alexandria, however, remained in the hands of the priests and faithful who were on the side of Athanasius.[4]

Furthermore, in the assault on the church some persons had been killed. As a result, a protest, dated Feb. 12, 356, was sent to the Emperor, though he was involved in the whole matter, complaining that through the fault of one Syrianus, still more martyrs had died in Egypt.[5]

Constantius responded with a letter to the senate and people of Alexandria denouncing Athanasius as a trouble-maker who must be broken, on penalty of their being considered enemies of the emperor.[6] The letter was delivered by Heraclius who arrived with the new prefect of Egypt, Cataphronius. Four days after their arrival (June 14, 356) the churches of the city were taken away from the Catholics aligned with Athanasius, and turned over to the Arians.[7] Constantius was really taking a hand in ecclesiastical affairs, at this point.

Thereafter a movement was initiated to have petitions signed by the members of the senate of Alexandria, and even by the priests of the pagan idols, in which they declared that they would accept as bishop him whom the Emperor would send to them.[8] The priests of the pagan temples, of course, had no interest in who was or was not bishop of the Christians, but when they were informed that their temples would be closed or destroyed if they did not sign the petition, they did not hesitate to affix their signature.[9]

Heraclius, for the time being, acted as administrator of the church of Alexandria. As assistants in this office he had the prefect of Egypt, Cataphronius, the treasurer of Egypt, Faustinus, and the *dux,* Sebastianus.[10] After eight months of this dictatorship

[4] Cf. *Hist. aceph.,* c. 5; also St. Athanasius, *Apologia de fuga sua,* c. 24; *MPG,* XXV, 673.

[5] Cf. *Hist. ar.,* cc. 81 ff.; *MPG,* XXV, 792, 793, 796; also c. 60; *MPG,* XXV, 765.

[6] Cf. *Hist. ar.,* c. 48; *MPG,* XXV, 752.

[7] Cf. *Hist. aceph.,* cc. 5-6.

[8] Cf. *Hist. ar.,* c. 54; *MPG,* XXV, 757.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] Cf. *Hist. ar.,* cc. 55, 59; MPG, XXV, 760.

(Feb. 24, 357), an Arian bishop was finally installed in Alexandria, George of Cappadocia,[11] an ecclesiastical adventurer who had been elected and ordained at Antioch, in an area where the Emperor was more likely to find men loyal to his imperial interests than in Egypt, where the Patriarch should normally have been elected.

The intruder, supported by the *dux,* Sebastianus, undertook to subject the bishops of Egypt to his communion. Quickly sixteen bishops were banished, while more than thirty fled into the desert as Athanasius had. Successors were provided for all of these bishops from among pagans, some not even catechumens, and among members of the municipal senates and among the rich who were able to pay for their elevation and become bishops "at auction," as it were.[12]

Constantius then became obsessed with the desire to re-establish unity among the bishops. Among those of the West, some abandoned Athanasius, others did not. Both groups were worried that no matter what they did there might be, beyond the immediate case of the Patriarch of Alexandria, a question as to the Symbol of Nicea. In his anxiety over this matter the Emperor showed himself both hesitant and obstinate.[13]

Before going to Rome for the celebration of his *vicennalia* on May 22, 357, the Emperor had Pope Liberius brought to him,[14] hoping to persuade him to join the side of the bishops who now followed the court. Pope Liberius was intransigent,[15] as appears from a source which Sozomenus mentions,[16] and which is conserved in the *Historia ecclesiastica* of Theodoretus[17] under the title "Dia-

[11] Cf. *Hist. ar.*, c. 75; *MPG*, XXV, 784.

[12] Cf. St. Athanasius, *Apologia ad Constantium*, c. 28; *MPG*, XXV, 692, 632; *Hist. ar.*, c. 73; *MPG*, XXV, 781.

[13] Cf. Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, IV, 11; *MPG*, LXVII, 1149.

[14] Cf. Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum*, XV, 7, 10, ed. V. Gardthausen, 1, 63. "Id enim ille [Constantius] Athanasio semper infestus, licet sciret impletum, tamen auctoritate quoque potiore aeternae urbis episcopi firmari desiderio nitebatur ardenti. Quo non impetrato Liberius aegre populi metu, qui eius amore flagrabat, cum magna difficultate noctis medio potuit asportari."

[15] Cf. Sozomenus, *ibid.*

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] Cf. Theodoretus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, II, 16; *MPG*, XXV, 1038.

logue of the Emperor Constantius and of Liberius, Bishop of Rome."[18]

In this Dialogue Constantius is reported as saying, "Since you are a Christian and bishop of our city we have judged it fitting to cause you to come and to invite you to refuse communion to the impious Athanasius, whose audacity is unspeakable. That has been decided by the whole world, which by the decision of a council has rejected him from ecclesiastical communion."

To this Liberius answered, according to the report, "Prince, ecclesiastical decisions must be pronounced with great justice. If, then, it please your piety, order us to judge him, and if Athanasius merits condemnation, we shall pass sentence against him in the forms of ecclesiastical procedure which are the rule. We cannot, however, condemn a man whom we have not judged."

"The whole world," said Constantius, "has pronounced upon his impiety, and from the first day he mocks it."

"Those who signed," answered Liberius, "did not know the facts of his case. . . ."

"Still, he has been judged," retorted Constantius, "while he was present, in the council which was held at Tyre, and all the bishops of the world have signed the sentence pronounced at that synod."

Eusebius, the eunuch, then interjected, "At the Council at Nicea, it was proved that he was outside of the Catholic faith."

Liberius, passing over this interruption, recalled to the emperor that the facts of the case had been investigated only by the five bishops who were sent into Egypt at the time of the council of Tyre. Of these five bishops, he noted, three were still living, Maris, Valens, and Ursacius, and their written reports, furthermore, were available. Whom, then, should one believe, their written reports, or the résumé thereof made by the reporters?

Bishop Epictetus then intervened, in an attempt to save the Emperor embarrassment. "Prince," he suggested, "what Liberius now says is neither said with a view to the faith, nor with a view to these ecclesiastical affairs, but solely for the sake of power at Rome

[18] It is a sort of report of the verbal exchange which took place in an audience granted to Liberius by the Emperor, in the presence of other personages, apparently, two of whom take part in the dialogue, viz. Eusebius, the eunuch, and Epictetus, Bishop of *Centumcellae.*

among the senators, that he may boast that he has stopped the Emperor with a syllogism."

Constantius, angered, rasped to Liberius, "How much do you think you are worth then in the world, you who take the side of an impious man, and trouble the peace of the entire world?"

"I may well be alone," answered Liberius simply, "the faith does not lose thereby. In older times there were found but three to resist."

"Do you then," exclaimed Eusebius, the eunuch, "compare our Emperor to Nabuchodonosor?"

Again Liberius paid no attention to the interruption and continued courageously to say that before examining the case of Athanasius it would be necessary to subscribe to the Symbol of Nicea, to recall those who had been sent into exile and to restore them to their churches. If, after that, it was discovered that those who had disturbed the Church were finally in accord as to "the Apostolic Faith," then all the bishops would go to Alexandria where they would hear the accusers and the accused.

Epictetus interrupted to say, "The *cursus publicus* (the imperial post service) will not suffice to transport the bishops!"[19]

Liberius answered him, "The Church has no need of the *cursus publicus. . . .*"

Constantius then revealed the personal resentment which inspired him, exclaiming, "Athanasius has injured the whole world, but none more than myself." He proceeded to accuse the bishop of Alexandria of having aroused the Emperor Constans, his brother, against him. He went on to declare that the defeat of Magnentius was of less advantage to him than the deposition of Athanasius.

Liberius responded, "Do not vent your rancor upon bishops, Prince. Ecclesiastical hands must only bless." He returned, then, to his original position that the Emperor should recall the bishops who had been banished, that unanimity should be restored in sub-

[19] Cf. Ammianus Marcellinus, *op. cit.*, XXI, 16, 18, where he reproaches Constantius II for having abused the *cursus publicus* and having called the bishops too frequently to synods. "Christianam religionem absolutam et simplicem anili superstitione confundens, in qua scrutanda perplexius quam componenda gravius, excitavit discidia plurima, quae progressa fusius aluit concertatione verborum, ut *catervis antistitum iumentis publicis ultro citroque discurrentibus per synodos,* quas appellant, dum ritum omnem ad suum trahere conantur arbitrium, *rei vehicularie succideret nervos*" (Italics mine).

mission to the Symbol of Nicea, and that thereafter together they should examine what was needed to restore peace in the world.

The Emperor, however, was of another mind. "There is question of but one thing. . . . Join the party of peace, sign, and you shall return to Rome."

"I have said farewell," answered Liberius, "to my brethren at Rome. The laws of the Church are more important than residence at Rome."

"You have three days to decide," the Emperor announced, "if you wish to sign, you shall return to Rome; if not, pick out the place where you wish to live in exile."

"Three days will not change my decision," responded Liberius, "send me into exile wheresoever you will."

Two days later Pope Liberius was notified that the place of his exile was to be Berea, in Thrace.[20] Contrary to all the laws, Constantius II considered Liberius as exiled and thus civilly dead, and caused a successor, Felix, to be installed in his place.[21] The man was ordained in the imperial palace, apparently at Milan. Three eunuchs were appointed to represent the people, and Acacius presided at the ceremony.[22]

It causes slight wonder, then, that Athanasius seeing all these moves of the Caesar-pope, Constantius II, considered him practically the Anti-christ.[23] What does he lack of the traits of the Anti-christ? When the Anti-christ will appear, will he not discover, to deceive the elect, the way all traced out by Constantius? Has not the Emperor transported the churches into his palace, and does he not presume to pronounce ecclesiastical judgments? Even the con-

[20] When Liberius was about to depart for his exile Constantius II had 500 *solidi* given to him for expenses. The Pope refused them, saying, "Go, give back this money to the Emperor. He needs it for his soldiers." He refused also the money which the Empress wished him to accept. The eunuch, Eusebius, who also tried to give him money, was repulsed. Liberius told him to become a Christian first. The Dialogue closes with this triple refusal. This is the man who is sometimes said to have betrayed the faith!

[21] Cf. *Liber pontificalis,* tom. I, p. 204, note by Duchesne.

[22] Cf. *Hist. ar.,* c. 75; *MPG* XXV, 784; also St. Jerome *De Viris Illustribus,* c. 98; *HPL,* XXIII, 699.

[23] Cf. *Hist. ar.,* c. 76; *MPG,* XXV, 785.

secration of Felix seemed, to Athanasius, a thing similar to the perversions of the Anti-christ.[24]

At Milan, when the accusers of Athanasius were embarrassed by the firmness of the bishops who defended him, Constantius finally could stand it no longer and exclaimed, "It is I who accuse Athanasius." Here, continued Athanasius, is the Anti-christ. He is cloaked in Christianity, he enters into the holy places, he stands there, he makes them a desert. He violates the canons, he imposes his decree by force.[25]

Against this tyranny, this Caesaropapism, of Constantius II, the Catholic conscience protested. The West, with bishops Osius, St. Hilary, and Lucifer of Cagliari in the lead, strove to resist the grasping hand of the Emperor. Athanasius also denounced the pretensions of the Emperor to mix into the affairs of the Church, and the willing servitude of the Arian bishops who accepted his invasion. The West and Egypt, during this period, expounded and exalted the primacy of the spiritual against the attempts of the temporal to subjugate and dominate it. Still, it was only after the death of Constantius (Nov. 3, 361), that Athanasius was again able to enter Alexandria (Feb. 21, 362), after freedom had once more been granted to those of the orthodox faith.

The story of St. Athanasius is the old familiar one of attempted incursions by the secular power upon the Church, stemming from the early, pre-Christian, tradition of union of religious and civil leadership in the person of the head of the state. Here, too, the incursions were aided by men within the Church who should have been firm in maintaining its independence, but who, for reasons of personal advancement, chose to go to the secular power, thinking perhaps to guide it to serve their interests, but actually exposing a flank of the Church to attack.

In the case of St. Athanasius it was the Arians who sought the support of the Emperor to gain for themselves positions of prominence and of control in ecclesiastical affairs, so that they might escape from the position in which they had been placed by the decisions of the Council of Nicea as to the Symbol of Faith. They nearly succeeded, for they found in the person of Constantius II an Emperor who would have liked only too well to re-establish

[24] Cf. *Hist. ar.*, c. 75; *MPG*, XXV, 784.

[25] Cf. *Hist. ar.*, c. 77; *MPG*, XXV, 785.

himself in the traditional position of the Emperors of Rome at the head of not only civil but also religious affairs. It was not until he died that the long and bitter conflict came temporarily to an end.

The conflict in the present case was doctrinal, but there was latent in it a conflict also along geographical lines. In the split of the Roman world begun by Diocletian when he divided the Empire there lurked the danger that a rising "nationalism," if such it can be called, or at least "regionalism" would make a breach in the universal, the Catholic, Church, which would subsequently allow the temporal power to invade the provinces reserved to the spiritual.

When region began to vaunt itself against region it was not unnatural that the feeling of regional pride, of regional superiority, should seep into the consciousness of those who, though not of the world, still were destined to live therein. As conflicts, then, were engendered between ecclesiastics of various regions they were easily led to rely upon that which distinguished the regions, the temporal, in their attempts to prove themselves superior to those who were, in reality, and should have been, in their thoughts, their brethren in Christ.

Through this breach it was not too difficult for those who still nourished the ancient tradition of union of church and state in the person of the head of the state to advance their ideas. Under the guise of assisting the churchmen in their struggle with other churchmen of a different region they could render themselves more and more indispensible until, as usually happens with those who become indispensible, they effectively controlled those who had thought to use them, when they first called upon them for assistance.

More than once, in the subsequent history of the Church, has St. Athanasius' observation about the Anti-christ following the way marked out for him by Constantius II seemed apposite. More than once has a split on a point of doctrine, or a refusal to abide by a decision of the universal Church led churchmen to seek the support of the temporal power which has thus found away to dominate the spiritual. More than once, too, when "regionalism" was thoroughly established, have the lesser conflicts and splits of regional prejudices given an opportunity for the temporal to compromise the primacy of the spiritual.

Against that tendency, however, God has, when the occasion required it, raised up a St. Athanasius to fight valiantly against the

encroachments of the temporal and to defend energetically the independence of the Church. He has, at the same time, provided such a champion with the backing of a Julius I, a Liberius, an Osius, a St. Hilary of Poitiers, a Lucifer of Cagliari, the monks of Egypt, men who were no less willing than the champion to suffer exile and hardship rather than yield to any incursion upon the rights of the Kingdom of God.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN AMERICA

I take to witness the faith and devotion of Catholics in America. Where is piety more deep and warm, where is purity more celestial than in our convents? Where is self sacrifice more unreserved, zeal more ardent than in the lives and labors of our priesthood? Glance down the naves and aisles of our temples and see our Catholics at prayer; see the thronging multitudes, multitudes of men as well as of women, that press around the altar rail, not merely on great festivals, but also on the ordinary Sunday, and tell me what land in Christendom shows sights more consoling, more enchanting. Follow those multitudes to their homes, to their shops and marts; study them as they mingle with their non-Catholic fellow citizens—is there upon their cheeks a blush of shame for their religion? Is there upon their lips a word of disloyalty to the Church? I challenge the most Catholic land to show Catholics more courageous in making profession of their faith, more consistent in carrying its principles into their daily life. And if you pass from the external manifestations of their faith to an examination of the faith itself, is not that faith as intact and undefiled as it is bold and firm? Is it not, to the smallest detail, the faith of Peter, the Supreme Shepherd of the flock, to whom they are as closely united in love and obedience as ever were Catholics in any country of Christendom?

—Archbishop Ireland, in "The Church in America," from his *The Church and Modern Society* (St. Paul, 1905), II, 231 f.

BACKGROUNDS OF SECULARISM

The 1947 and 1948 statements of the American hierarchy on secularism merited the extraordinary reception which they received. The statements were an orderly, incisive and inclusive catalogue of the devastating effects which secularism is having on our modern culture; they pointed out its influence on the individual, the family, education, the economic order, and the international community. The press comments on the statements, however, were not fully aware that the declarations had reiterated and reinforced the very heart of the most penetrating thought within the Church today. In fact, the assertions of the Bishops made official the ever growing conviction of the most profound Catholic thinkers that the greatest enemy of the day is not atheism or communism but secularism, "the practical exclusion of God from human thinking and living." It is not so much the open denial or disavowal of Christianity which "blights our heritage of Christian culture" as the by-passing of Christianity which sterilizes its dynamic force.

That secularism has been the father of errors and evils is the theme of many Catholic writers, Christopher Dawson at their head. He frequently states that the dualism in society which has excluded religion from all the important concerns of life is the fountainhead of the current miseries of society. He reviews all civilizations and concludes: "never before has a society been so completely secularized." The gravity of secularism is increased, he adds, because so few realize its menace; even the best Christians tend to accept the restriction of religion to a tiny area of life's pattern. And Dawson warns: "If religion loses hold of social life it eventually loses hold on life altogether."

Jacques Maritain is no less apprehensive of the dire effects of a split in society by which religion is denied any influence beyond the inner forum of conscience. In *The Things That Are Not Caesar's* Maritain often speaks of the terrible error by which the Church has been outlawed from all phases of modern life. In *Scholasticism* and *Politics* he laments "the separatism and dualism which have reigned too long" and he looks to Catholic Action to restore the organic vitality of all that which has been inhumanly dissociated.

Similar indictments of secularism can be found in other Catholic thinkers. Emmet Hughes, in his book, *The Church and the Liberal Society,* gives an excellent analysis of the origins and nature of secularism. The one effect of the religious upheaval of the sixteenth century which outweighs all the rest, writes Carlton Hayes, is the impetus given to secularism. Michael De La Bedoyere states in his *Christianity in the Market Place* that the Church is in desperate need of a "point of insertion" into the world from which she has been excluded. Ours is an age, says Berdyaev in *End of Our Time,* which denies nothing but question-marks all, an age not of atheists but blank skeptics.

The recent Pontiffs have been unanimous in pointing to secularism as public enemy number one. Leo XIII frequently said that the separation of religion and modern culture is the greatest modern aberration. His *Annum sacrum* is most in point with the Bishops' statements. Pius XI in his encyclical, *Quas primas,* in which he established the feast of Christ the King, named laicism or secularism as the basic error of the day. Pius XII, by his continual reference to the lost unity of mankind and to the departmentalism of modern life shows how deeply he realizes the evils attendant on secularism. In his allocution to the Cardinals in February, 1946, he said: "She [the Church] must today as never before live her mission; she must reject more emphatically than ever that false and narrow concept of her spirituality and her interior life which would confine her, blind and mute, in the retirement of the sanctuary."

The flowering of secularism came at the time of the Renaissance and the Reformation. With the Renaissance secular culture emancipated itself from the tutelage of the Church. There came to be a new, laicized world, with no bonds to the Church. To religion was conceded only the right of ruling the life of the conscience of individuals; its social efficacy was overlooked or denied.

This secularist mentality was advanced by the Reformers. It should be carefully noted, however, that both Luther and Calvin personally were social conservatives. Luther believed in the idea of a church-civilization; he was unalterably and even violently opposed to the developing commercial civilization. Calvin, while somewhat less severe on economic individualism than Luther, nonetheless accepted the medieval doctrine that ethics and economics

are one. In political theory Calvin was so severe that he denied any distinction between the temporal and spiritual orders; both, under his system, would be part of a theocratic rule.

Dualism in society was, however, the inevitable result of the Reformers' denial of the spiritual authority of the Church. Men who drew out the secularist implications in the new Protestant doctrines arose all over Europe. In Germany the doctrine proceeded logically and tragically to Kant, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche and the Nazis. In France, and in Catholic countries generally, the advance of secularism was not as rapid as in the northern lands. Until 1700 the Church's teachings here continued in some way to permeate social life. But when the Industrial Revolution occurred the Church had been almost completely driven out of the public life of Europe. The complete strangulation of the Church's influence on France's public life was intended by the stringent secularization laws of 1905.

The secularist tide did not touch the United States until after the Constitution was framed. After 1800 the secularist mentality takes an ever firmer grip on America. The basic natural-law concepts of the Constitution are forgotten. Economic and political life grow without references to religious norms. Education, basically religious up to the middle of the last century, becomes laicized by Horace Mann. Religion, the very mainspring of American culture, ceases to be of any major concern.

The worst tragedy, however, in this long and lamentable secularization of Christendom was the attitude of acceptance and resignation on the part of Catholics. To the policy of exclusion, the reaction of many Catholics was to reinforce the very thing that was attacking them. They retreated into a purely personal religious practice; devotions were introduced which minimized the communal character of the faith. And the exclusion of Christianity from the market-place and the forum came to be acknowledged by some as a blessing in disguise. The majority of Catholics had lost the mediaeval and truly Catholic ideal of religion as the very soul of the social organism. They gave way to the new economic and political realities so at variance with the traditional Catholic philosophy of society.

Such, however, has never been the official teaching of the Church, however silent her local leaders or lowly her position. She has

always claimed for her King the whole man, the whole of society, the whole world. Christ's Kingship must be preached "until He has put all enemies under His feet."

In our day there have been instituted among other things Catholic Action and the Feast of Christ the King, both specifically designed to counteract secularism. The slowness with which they become popular is due to the fact that the faithful do not realize the implications of the secularism which these institutions are established to overcome. Catholic Action has scarcely been mentioned in the Catholic press as the specific remedy for the dangers described in the Bishops' statement—an indication of how little is known of the precise nature of Catholic Action.

When Pius XI was planning his pontificate, he thought of the awful evolution by which Christian Man had become natural Man and then economic Man. He saw that society divorced from God was "reverting to barbarism." He therefore decided that Catholics could not cling to inherited patterns of thought and action. They must organize an unprecedented movement to reassert the hegemony of Christ over all men and all phases of life. That movement is Catholic Action.

From all the writings of Pius XI it is clear that he considered Catholic Action to be the instrument by which the laity would restore God to the vast regions of modern life from which He had been excluded and to which the clergy had no means of entry. Catholic Action was to be the training ground for the leaders of economic and political life, men who would actuate the social message of the Church. Catholic Action, in short, is the Church's answer to the secularization of the world.

As Msgr. Civardi, the writer of the authoritative *Manual of Catholic Action* states: "Catholic Action is, in a manner, a dyke against the overwhelming tide of secularism." The papally-authorized motto of Catholic Actionists confirms this: "To restore *all* things in Christ." So also their device: "Thy Kingdom Come." And their official patron and model is St. Francis Assisi, he who saw Christ in everything.

The words which Pius XI uses in describing the task of Catholic Action are much like those of the Bishops' statements. He frequently states that Catholic Action was invented precisely to over-

come the godlessness in the fields of human life where the Bishops see secularism most rampant. Catholic Action is to sanctify the individual, restore Christ to family life, re-establish the Cross in the classroom, bring Christian principles to the factory and inaugurate the reign of Christ over international society. And nothing else but Catholic Action, says Pius XI, can be expected to accomplish this tremendous task.

That the Feast of Christ the King is not of more significance twenty years after its establishment derives from the same failure to comprehend the error of secularism which it was appointed to combat. The want of popularity for this Feast is due not merely to the unfamiliarity of Americans with royalty, but more to the narrow concept of Catholicism which too many of the faithful retain. The whole point of the Feast is to announce to the world that Christ can and must reign, that His Kingdom must prevail, that His reign must be established. All of this is not particularly urgent, or even understandable, to those who have not seen the confinement of Christianity to the sacristy and the cloister as something pernicious and subversive to all true religion. A truly universal devotion to Christ the King can come only when the faithful realize that their King has been dethroned by the secularists of the modern world.

Let all Catholics then turn to an ever deeper study of secularism. The subtle reasoning of the brilliant Popes and the conclusions of the deepest thinkers of modern Christendom have been reinforced by the Bishops' authoritative statements. These impressive, compelling diagnoses of our sick society must not be allowed to die after a tribute in the press. Let it be implemented by a more penetrating analysis of secularism, a broader-based notion of Catholic Action and a more vigorous campaign to reassert the claims of Christ the King over all spheres of life. Let the 1947 and 1948 episcopal statements be the turning point in the development of Catholic Action in America. Let them be the charter for a new movement dedicated to restore Christianity to the major activities of mankind from which it has been excluded.

ROBERT F. DRINAN, S.J.

Georgetown University
Washington, D. C.

THE NEW HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS

PART II

HARDING-DE VAUX COLLECTION

The description of this collection can be outlined rather briefly since for the time being our knowledge is limited to Fr. de Vaux' notice (E, a.).[1] Beside the fragments of pottery which help to determine the size of the original manuscript-content of the cave and the lowest date at which the documents were deposited in the cave and when the cave was visited last before its recent discovery, the investigation of the cave yielded a considerable number of fragments of manuscripts. These are all in Hebrew, excepting a few pieces apparently in Greek. There is no Aramaic in these fragments, according to the first report. The Hebrew script of the fragments is generally of the square Hebrew type familiar from the editions of the Hebrew Bible. But there are also fragments with the older Phoenician script, of the same type as that of the Lachish documents (sixth century B. C.). From characteristic phrases preserved in that Phoenician script, it appears that one of the manuscripts contained originally the Book of Leviticus or at least chapters 19-22 of that book, that is to say, part of the Code of Holiness (*Lev.* 17-26). This fact is bound to raise questions. The answer will depend on whether the manuscript represented by those fragments is as ancient as the script might suggest or whether a more recent scribe used the ancient script for this manuscript for some particular reason. Other fragments in the square Hebrew type belong to Genesis, Deuteronomy and Judges; from this it may be concluded that those books also were contained in the library stored in the cave. The rest of the fragments represent non-biblical writings which must have formed a large part of the original library. The material used in some of the manscripts is leather, with the square Hebrew type of script, and in other manuscripts, papyrus, also with the square Hebrew writing. The Leviticus fragments are parchment. According to a letter of Dr. Sellers (A, c: p. 22), Fr. de Vaux thinks that he has found also a fragment of the original Hebrew text of the book of Jubilees or

[1] Parenthetical references throughout this article refer to the bibliography printed as footnote 1 in the first installment *AER*, CXXII, 1 (Jan. 1950), 25-36.

Little Genesis. This letter, dated April 19, 1949, is more recent than Fr. de Vaux' note in the *Revue Biblique*. From this, then, we may infer very reasonably that the collection of the cave included a copy of that Apocryphal work which has otherwise survived only in Ethiopic and Latin versions and in Greek fragments. The presence of the book in the cave might have a bearing on the question of its date—end of the first century B. C. according to some critics, a little earlier (153 to 105 B. C.) according to others (cf. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,* II, 6). The Hebrew text of Jubilees in the cave-library would be very close to the date of its composition. All this shows that the library stored in the cave was an extensive collection, and that what is extant now in the Syrian and the Jewish collections represents only a small part of the library.

THE SYRIAN COLLECTION

This consists of the following texts:

(A) *The Book of Isaias.* The Isaias scroll was reported early in the news released to the public, as it had a special appeal for biblical students. Suffice it to recall that it is roughly a thousand years older than any other Hebrew text of a book of the Bible known so far, and even, possibly, the oldest existing manuscript of a biblical book in any language (B, c. p. 23). Hence the news of the discovery of such an ancient copy of Isaias raised great expectations. Several even thought that this would provide an answer to the question of the authorship of the second part of Isaias. But though not all the hopes were to be fulfilled, it remains that the discovery is a fact of the highest significance, as pointed out below.

The scroll is described very completely by Dr. Trever (B, a: pp. 4-9) and also by Dr. Sukenik in his introduction (pp. 34-35) to the text of Chapters 42 and 43 of Isaias reproduced by him (pp. 36-43). The text of the scroll has been analyzed very carefully by Dr. Millar Burrows from the point of view of textual criticism (B, b: pp. 16 ff.; B, c: pp. 24 ff.). The text published by Dr. Sukenik in transcription with the Masoretic text opposite, has been used for their remarks of textual criticism by Fr. Tournay, O.P. (D, b: pp. 227 ff.) and Fr. Bauchet (D, d: pp. 310-312). There are photographic reproductions of passages of Isaias in

A, b: p. 48, so small that a magnifying glass has to be used, reproducing Isaias 38, 9 to 40:1 (right hand column) and 40:1-28 (left hand column). A larger reproduction of Isaias 40:1-28 is given in B, a: p. 6. As "an example of an especially bad bit of copying," Isaias 4:6^{b}-5:7 is reproduced in B, a: p. 21. Other photographs of different passages from Isaias appear in B, c: pp. 8-9 and p. 26. Though those reproductions are rather blurred it is possible to get from them a good idea of the script and of the different hands represented in the manuscript of Isaias.

The scroll is 23¾ feet long, made up of 17 sheets of parchment 10 x 25 in. high, sewn together with thread. The manuscript which contains the complete book of Isaias was originally protected by a cover now lost, torn by the Bedouins, but its former presence is clear from the needle holes and pieces of thread still there. To prepare the text for regular writing, it was lined horizontally with a sharp instrument—these lines can be discerned in some of the photographs mentioned above. The letters hang from those lines, only the Lamed (L) going above the line. The writing has a very regular appearance. The words are clearly separated, but not the sentences. The text is divided into paragraphs which have nothing in common with our chapters and verses. There are in the margin nine different kinds of signs supposed to be reading aids, but their precise nature has not been explained as yet (B, a.). Three such signs, not identical with those used in Isaias, appear also in "the Sectarian document" described further on. Occasionally the scribe made mistakes, omitting a letter or a word or a group of words here and there. Some of the mistakes were corrected by the scribe himself, others by different persons as they used the book. This accounts for the differences in script that appear in the book (B, c: pp. 6 ff.).

The text reproduced in this scroll differs in many particulars from that found in our Hebrew Bibles (MT.: Masoretic text). Thus in Chap. 42 Fr. Tournay counts a hundred variants and in Chap. 43, one hundred and forty-two variants. Only two verses (42:12, 18) are free from any variant (D, b: pp. 227 f.). However, it would be wrong to conclude from the large number of variants that the Isaias scroll represents a special recension of the book of Isaias, a new recension to be placed alongside of those known before, MT and the Greek. The fact is that the Hebrew

text of the scroll is essentially identical with MT; many of the variants are due to the peculiar spelling of the manuscripts, especially to the superabundance of the "Matres lectionis," i.e. the use of the letters Alef, He, Waw and Yod to express vowel sounds for which in the old writing there were no special signs. The tendency in the Isaias-scroll and in the others also is to introduce those letters everywhere. If we disregard the variants of the kind just described, we may say that the new text of Isaias agrees substantially with MT. and therefore supports the fidelity of the Masoretic tradition (M. Burrows: A, c: p. 60; B, a: p. 17), an important fact from the point of view of the history of the Hebrew text of the Bible and of textual criticism. This of course must not be construed as meaning that MT should be regarded as correct everywhere. In fact, in several places the new text differs from MT. and agrees with readings of the Greek or corrections proposed by the critics. Thus, while supporting MT it warns us that MT. is not to be followed blindly, and at the same time that MT deserves our careful attention and should not be corrected arbitrarily.

One question to which an answer could not be expected in view of any date to which our new text may be assigned reasonably—about 100 B.C. or earlier, the first half of the second century B.C. (B, c: p. 23; B, c: pp. 33 ff.; cf. B.A.S.O.R. #110, p. 3)—is that of the authorship of the second part of Isaias (Chap. 40 ff.). The problem of Deutero-Isaias did not exist then: cf. *Ecclus.* 48:22-25 (=25—28 in the Vulgate). The reproduction of Isaias 40 mentioned above (A, b: p. 49) shows no special separation between Chaps. 39 and 40. Thus the manuscript contributes nothing to the literary problem. It may even be said that if a manuscript *of that period* spoke definitely in favor of Deutero-Isaias, we might suspect the hand of a forger acquainted with our literary problems.

The scroll shows traces of considerable use before it was stored in the cave. The back of the manuscript has been darkened by the hands of the people who held it while reading it. There are also several tears which were repaired in antiquity.

(B) *Commentary on Habacuc.* This scroll was identified by

Dr. Brownlee (A, b: p. 52) who has also given us a first translation with notes (B, b: pp. 8 ff.; cf. B, d: pp. 9 f.). Good photographic reproductions of some fragments appear in A, b: p. 59 and B, a: p. 15. The manuscript, described by Dr. Trever (B, a: pp. 12-14), is now incomplete. It is 59½ in. long, but something is missing at the beginning. The first line of the extant text begins with the words: "I cry out and not"—i.e. *Hab.* 1:2. Parts of the lines are missing on the sides of the columns shown in the photographs. The lower part of the manuscript is damaged, with the result that some lines have disappeared. Thus, the scroll has suffered considerably. The writing is clear and beautiful as well as perfectly regular, as the scroll was lined horizontally to guide the hand of the scribe and vertically to mark the beginning of the columns. One peculiarity of this manuscript is that the divine name YHWH in the quotations of the text of the prophet is written in the old characters. In his own text the Commentator uses the name El (God). The commentary quotes a part of the prophet's text and the explanation of that text follows immediately, introduced by the phrase: "its meaning" or the like. As an illustration we may take the first six lines of column 2 (Plates III: B, a: p. 15): "And in uprightness. They come to smite and to plunder the cities of the land, for this is what it [he] says: [Hab. 1, b^b]: to possess dwellings not his; dreadful and terrible is he, from himself his judgment and his destruction proceed. Its meaning is about [=it refers to] the Kitti'īm whose dread—upon all the nations. And with counsel are all their thoughts to do evil, and with cunning and deceit they go with all the peoples." Then, in lines 6-9, follow 1:8-9 of the text of Habacuc with the explanation in lines 9 ff. The Kitti'īm of our Commentator may be identified with Kittīm or Kittiyīm of the Old Testament (*Gen.* 10:4; *Isaias* 23:1, 12; *I Mac.* 1:1; 8:5) i.e. the island of Cyprus, but the name was applied afterwards to other countries beyond Cyprus as in Mac. where it refers to Macedonia. In our Commentator it denotes the enemies of Israel. One of the documents in the Jewish Collection also speaks of them: the Kittiyīm of Assur and the Kittiyīm of Misrayim (Egypt), and joins them with the host of Belial, the band of Edom and Moab and the Ammonites and Philistia. Quite obviously it is the same enemy that is meant in all

those texts: this is one of the points of contact between the various non-biblical documents of the cave.[2]

(C) *The "Sectarian Document."* This name was given by Dr. M. Burrows (A, b: p. 58), and may well be kept as denoting a document belonging to a religious group, a *sect* within Judaism. For this, we may compare the word αἵρεσις in the Acts, denoting a school of thought, a party etc. (cf. 5:17; 15:5; 24:5, 14; 28:22). This document is a kind of manual for the use of a group as can be concluded from the present first column reproduced on Plate II (B, a: p. 10) which seems to be part of a ceremony of initiation, as suggested by the reference to "entering into the covenant" (lines 16, 18, 24). The first two lines are incomplete, indeed the beginning of the document is lost, in which there must have been an introduction of some kind. Beginning with the end of line 2 we read, translating the text literally: ". . . as he (3) commanded by the hand of Moses—and all his servants the prophets, and to love all (4) that He has chosen and to hate all that He has rejected, to keep away from all evil, (5) and to cling to all works of good and to do truth and justice and judgment (6) in the land and not to walk further in the firmness of heart [= stubbornness] of crime and eyes of fornication [cf. *Ezech.* 6:4]."

The text goes on in a long series of infinitive sentences stating what is to be done and not to be done, down to line 20. Then, after referring to the priests and levites celebrating all the victories and all the deeds of God's fidelity, the section concludes: " . . . and all those that enter into the covenant say after them: Amen, Amen." The style of this page, as may be gathered from the few lines just quoted, reminds us of Deuteronomy; it is hortatory, appealing to the motives of love of God, loyalty to God, hatred and avoidance of evil. There are also words and phrases which

[2] Cf. also Ginsberg, B, b: p. 20 f. There might be a pun in the choice of the word. There is in non-biblical Hebrew the word *kat* (plural: kittīm) meaning a party, a group of persons banded together for some cause. The word in our text could then suggest "partisans" of Assur and "partisans" of Egypt. The allusion might be to political parties within Judaism leaning on the forces typified by Assur and Egypt, and the other enemies of Israel referred to under the names of the traditional foes, Edom, etc. To settle the point, we must await the publication of the complete texts, for, then, it will be possible to determine the nature of some of the documents. One of these—the "War"—seems to be an Apocalyptic composition.

connect this document with the Jewish Collection. Thus the word for "crime" (ashmāh) (lines 6 to 23), the phrase "the sons of light" and "the sons of darkness" (lines 9, 10), "the dominion of Belial" (lines 18, 23-24), may be mentioned among the typical expressions proving the relationship of both collections as parts of one same group. Who they were, we do not know. We may rule out as improbable the view that it was the Essenes who indeed lived in this region. We have no positive arguments to confirm the supposition. Some of the texts breathe a warlike spirit which seems alien to the Essenes. However, in the great rebellion of 66-70 A.D., many Essenes joined the Zealots in the war against Rome. Hence it is difficult to be very definite. To answer more definitely we should have the full text and also compare the so-called Damascus document (cf. M. Burrows, A, b: p. 58; Tournay, D, b: p. 233).

This scroll, the second largest in the Syrian collection, is 6 ft. 1¼ inches long and 9½ in. high. It is made up of 5 sheets of coarser material (parchment) than Isaias. There is an average of 26 lines to the column as in the Plate commented upon above. The scroll was not lined for writing—at least there is not much evidence of it. Hence some irregularity, but not too much. When the Syrians brought the document to the American School, it was in two pieces, and very brittle so that much repairing of cracks was necessary when it was unrolled. In this case also the original cover has disappeared. The writing is very clear and legible, though in places the ink had faded at an ancient date so that many letters were inked over again. The copyist made many mistakes which he corrected. On the plate referred to above, we see one correction: in line 16 instead of the letter 'ain (in the verb "shall enter" [into the covenant] the scribe had written first an Alef. The 'ain was written over, but the lower part of the Alef may still be discerned.

(D) *The Fourth Scroll.* This is apparently a text of considerable length, but it has not been identified so far, because it has not been possible to unroll it: part of it has become almost a solid mass. It has suffered considerably, and large parts of the leather have crumbled away, so that when it becomes possible to open the scroll, many portions of the text will be missing. For a photograph of the scroll, with two small pieces detached from it con-

taining writing too small to read with an ordinary magnifying glass, see A, b: p. 53. Dr. Trever, who describes this scroll in B, a: pp. 14 ff., declared at first that it was impossible to read the writing on the broken fragments. But in February, 1949, (B, c: p. 6) he identified the language as Aramaic. We must wait until the scroll has been treated to make it pliable, so that the nature of its contents may be determined.[3]

(E) We may mention here a small fragment presented to Dr. Trever, 2½ by 1.62 in., of which it is not known to what document it belonged. Two Aramaic words that can be recognized suggest that the document is in Aramaic (B, a: p. 16).

(F) Dr. G. E. Wright reports (A, c: p. 33) that beside the first four scrolls described above, Mar A. Y. Samuel has brought to this country a group of manuscript fragments. Some of them belong to two different copies of the book of Daniel. Early reports from Jerusalem (April 26, 1948) spoke of Daniel as being one of the manuscripts purchased by the Hebrew University. The news was denied, and there is nothing in Sukenik's *Megillot genuzot* to support it. Nevertheless, the fact is that Daniel was in the library of the cave. One of the fragments, containing parts of two columns, gives the text of Dan. 1:10-16 and 2:2-6, thus the beginning of the first Aramaic section of Daniel. The other fragments—two of them—contain parts of Dan. 3:23-30, also in Aramaic. The differences between these new representatives of Daniel and its MT form are said to be of the same nature as those existing between the Isaias Scroll and MT of Isaias, largely differences in spelling, so that here again the fidelity of the traditional text is confirmed, at least for those parts of Daniel. An interesting fact is that the library hidden in the cave apparently had two copies of the book of Daniel: the book must have had a special interest for the group to which this collection of scrolls belonged. We can only hope that other portions of Daniel will be recovered or maybe the whole book. According to the view of many critics, the Semitic book of Daniel was completed in the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164 B.C.). The date to

[3] According to Canon J. Coppens (E, g: p. 310), Dr. Sukenik, in a lecture given in Louvain under the patronage of the Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense, stated that the scroll might possibly contain an Aramaic text, perhaps the first part of the book of Henoch. This, of course, would be a fact of great significance.

which the scrolls of the cave are assigned would imply that in this case we have copies from a time very close to the composition of the book. The discovery, thus, is of extraordinary interest and may lead to a re-examination of some of the problems of Daniel: an additional reason for wishing to recover a complete copy of its text.

(G) The fragments brought by Mar A. Y. Samuel contain also parts of another work, but the report says nothing of the nature of that document.

(To be continued)

EDWARD P. ARBEZ, S.S.

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

CHRIST'S JUBILEE

Jubilee is a Hebrew word; the Jews call it Jobel, and according to Theodoret it signifies remission and liberty. This year was full of gladness, having its trumpeters who stimulated the people to public rejoicings, because the slaves, afflicted, and exiles were restored to their pristine state and liberty. This was the figure of the clemency which was to be preached and announced by Christ and His trumpeters, the Apostles, to miserable sinners in the New Testament. Wherefore Christ (Luke iv.) testified of Himself in the Synagogue of Nazareth that now the prophecy of Isaiah (lxi.) was fulfilled, "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, therefore He hath anointed me; He hath sent me to preach the gospel to the poor, to heal those who are contrite of heart, to preach remission to the captives, and sight to the blind, to lift up those who are fallen, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord."

It is manifest, then, who is the author of the Jubilee in the New Testament, no other than Christ Himself, who appointed the acceptable time and the day of salvation.

—St. Peter Canisius, in his *Treatise on the Jubilee*, printed as an appendix to Thurston's *The Holy Year of Jubilee* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1949), pp. 394 f.

REGINA PATRIARCHARUM

The various titles under which the Catholic Church addresses Our Lady in the Litany of Loreto summarize, in a uniquely valuable way, God's revealed teaching about the Mother of Christ and about her place in the economy of our salvation. Thus the Catholic who is well instructed about the meaning of the many designations by which the faithful greet Mary in this intensely popular prayer of petition will possess a remarkably effective appreciation of that portion of Christian doctrine which deals with her. Furthermore, since a grasp of Mary's function in the divine plan of the redemption automatically and necessarily involves an understanding of what her divine Son is as to us and has done for us, a study or meditation upon the mysteries of Mary as set forth in the Litany of Loreto is inevitably conducive towards a better appreciation of Our Lord Himself.

Indeed, no one can have anything like an adequate grasp of the divinely revealed doctrine about Christ apart from a knowledge of Mary's co-operative role in His redemptive mission and in the functioning of His Mystical Body on earth, the Catholic Church. The Church's maternal and salvific work is something which can satisfactorily be described only with reference to the position in which God placed Mary in the plan of man's eternal salvation. So it is that in our own day, when loyalty to Our Lord and to His Church demand an intelligent and mature appreciation of God's teaching in their regard, a knowledge of the mysteries of Mary's place in the providential order of man's supernatural life is practically necessary for our Catholic people.

The last group of Our Lady's titles listed in her Litany of Loreto includes the eleven invocations of her as Queen. In the second of these the Church hails her as the Queen of Patriarchs. This particular title is the expression of one of the richest sections of Marian theology.

The patriarchs to whom the title refers are the men listed and described in the Old Testament as the fathers of the Israelitic nation. This group includes, first of all, the men who preserved the deposit of the primitive divine public revelation, taught it in their own families, and handed it down to their children. The patriarchal line centers around the figure of Abraham, to whom God made the

promise that in his seed all the nations of the earth were to be blessed.[1] Isaac, Jacob, and the sons of Jacob are listed as patriarchs because these were the men from whom the Israelitic nation, God's kingdom on earth according to the dispensation of the older covenant, was descended. So also are the men whose names are set down in the first and in the third Gospels as physically or legally the progenitors of Christ, in whom the promise made to Abraham was fulfilled.

One way to explain the prerogative of Mary as Queen of Patriarchs is to insist upon the fact that her life of grace and of faith was ineffably richer and stronger than that manifested in the great patriarchs of the Old Testament. In his recent and valuable contribution to Mariological science, the eminent Roman theologian, Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange adopts precisely this procedure. He teaches that the title is to be explained by the fact that Mary was more perfect in grace than Adam and that "her intimacy with God was much closer than that of Abel, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, or Joseph."[2] He points to the fact that her offering of Our Lord in the sacrifice of Calvary was the expression of a charity far more intense than that shown by Abraham when he prepared to immolate his son. In Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange's text, the perfection of Mary's life of grace and the heroicity of her virtues in comparison with those of the Old Testament fathers suffice to explain her position as the Queen of Patriarchs.

There is, however, still another and a more apposite way of explaining this title. Mary is pre-eminently and specifically the Queen of the Patriarchs precisely because she was called upon by God to make the ultimate and perfective contribution to the series of acts by which these men accomplished their individual mission in the economy of man's salvation. Like the prophets of the Old Testament and the apostles of the New Dispensation, the patriarchs had a definite and specific role to play in the great, over-all work of the redemption. And, according to the designs of God's providence, the Blessed Virgin Mary was destined to make the definitive contribution to this particular role, in such a way that the activity of all the patriarchs was truly preparatory for her consent to the Incarnation.

[1] Cf. *Gen.* 22:18.

[2] Cf. *The Mother of the Saviour and Our Interior Life*, translated by Bernard J. Kelly, C.S.Sp. (Dublin: Golden Eagle Books, Ltd., 1948), p. 278.

Thus she stands as actually the queen and the leader of these agents of God according to the lines of their own specific contribution to the salvific mission of Jesus Christ Our Lord.

In the divine plan of salvation, it was Abraham's prerogative to be the man in whose posterity all the nations of the earth were to be blessed. God's promises to the human race were to be fulfilled in and through the seed of Abraham. Isaac and Jacob were privileged to continue Abraham's paternal activity and to contribute towards the extension of that procreative work from which, ultimately, Christ was to come into the world.

Juda and those who came after him in the line of Our Lord's physical or juridical ancestors contributed directly to His advent. The other sons of Jacob, who are also numbered among the patriarchs, were the fathers of the Israelitic racial and religious community. Under the old covenant this community was, in a real though restricted sense, God's kingdom on earth. We must remember, moreover, that the kingdom of God in heaven, the Church triumphant, was depicted by Our Lord Himself as an assembly in which the elect would come from the east and the west and would sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob.[3]

Furthermore, the Church militant of the New Testament was designed by God to be the continuation of Israel, the Israel of God. This society is so intimately conjoined to Our Lord that it can accurately be designated as His body. Thus the society of which the patriarchs are the progenitors is the very company within which Christ dwells and rules and which He vivifies with the supernatural life of faith and grace. The patriarchs are the ancestors of a society within which men and women live as members of Christ.

St. Paul makes it clear that the posterity of Abraham, in whom the nations were to be blessed, was none other than Our Lord Himself. "To Abraham were the promises made, and to his seed. He saith not: And to his seeds, as of many: but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ."[4]

So it is that the particular and specific function of the patriarchs in the plan of man's salvation was to continue the paternal activity of Abraham in preparation for the advent of Christ and for the formation of that society which was truly to be the body of Christ. All of that activity, however, depended for its ultimate result upon

[3] Cf. *Matt.* 8:11. [4] *Gal.* 3:16.

the consent of Mary. By her consent to the Incarnation, and specifically by her consent to become the mother of a divine Son who was to suffer and to offer up His life for man's redemption, the end to which all of the patriarchs had contributed according to God's providential design was finally achieved. Her Son, the Person whose mother she consented to become, was the seed or posterity of Abraham in whom the nations were to find their blessing.

Such is the merciful power of God's goodness that we, who through His grace are incorporated into that society, become ourselves associated with Christ in His position and activity as the *semen Abrahae*. "For you are all the children of God by faith, in Christ Jesus," St. Paul tells us. And, he concludes, "if you be Christ's, then are you the seed of Abraham, heirs according to the promise."[5]

In his magnificent article, "Marie, l'eglise et le nouvel Israel," Fr. J. M. Bover, S.J., has brought out this aspect of Mary's prerogatives with matchless theological acumen.[6] He does not deal directly with the title as *Regina Patriarcharum*. He is principally concerned with showing the relations between the supernatural maternity of Mary and that of the Catholic Church itself. Essentially he treats of the meaning of the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse. It remains true, however, that all future research into the significance of Mary's title as Queen of Patriarchs will have to depend upon the doctrine he has set forth in this article.

In the light of this title we can begin to understand more perfectly why it is that the Church has always pointed to the patriarchs of the Old Testament as its own spiritual ancestors. We can better realize the extent and the intimacy of our own God-given association with Our Lord in His Church when we remember that we ourselves are, with Him and in Him, the *semen Abrahae*, and thus the children of that mother upon whose consent depended, in the designs of God's providence, the fulfillment of the promise made to Abraham.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[5] *Gal.* 3:26, 29.

[6] Cf. *Maria. Études sur la Sainte Vierge*, sous la direction d'Hubert du Manoir, S.J. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1949), I, 659-74.

Answers to Questions

VOLUNTARY SUBSTITUTION OF THE OFFICE

Question: I have been informed, on purely private authority, that it is lawful for a priest to depart from the prescribed Office of the day, as set down in his diocesan or congregational ordo, for one of his own selection, quite *ex devotione*. More specifically, I have been told that it is lawful at least four times a year to substitute for the Office prescribed in one's proper ordo another Office, provided the Office chosen is of about the same length. Is there any authority for making such a substitution?

Answer: An old decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, dated Feb. 13, 1666, forbids the substitution, *devotionis causa,* of one Breviary Office for another. Later theologians, however, seem to hold that the decree refers to habitual or frequent substitution of this sort, since they teach that devotion to a certain saint or mystery justifies the occasional change of the Office of the day for one in honor of the person or mystery of their special devotion.

St. Alphonsus (*Theologia moralis,* IV, 161) states that, while in general changing the prescribed Office for another of about the same length, even if done only three or four times a year, involves a venial sin, nevertheless, if the substitution is made for a valid reason (*ex aliqua rationabili causa*) there is no sin at all in the matter. Among sound reasons for such change he enumerates health, a journey, or special devotion to some saint. More modern authorities exempt from all sin the priest who on rare occasions substitutes one Office for another just for the sake of devotion. Thus, Genicot (*Institutiones theologiae moralis,* II, 52), and Piscetta-Gennaro (*Elementa theologiae moralis,* IV, 115).

NUNS ON ASH WEDNESDAY

Question: The celebrant on Ash Wednesday is directed to place the ashes on the head of the recipient but never on the covering of the head. What about the case of religious who wear a bandeau covering the forehead as far as the bridge of the nose?

Answer: The rubric of the Missal directs the celebrant to

place the ashes on his own head when there is no *dignior cleri* to do this for him. Presumably when he distributes the ashes to others he places them on the head of the recipient. Such is the understanding of authors and the general practice in the Church. When it becomes impossible to put the ashes on the head when the latter is covered with a veil, the conclusion is that they should be placed on the forehead (cf. Wapelhorst, 213, 4; Martinucci, II, xx, 29; Fortescue, 287). When the covering of the head involves also the veiling of the forehead, our solution would be to place the ashes on the head, even over the veil, rather than on the bridge of the nose. In other words, use what the French call *le système D. Débrouillez-vous,* get out of the difficulty the best way you can.

CLOTH OF GOLD FOR THE CIBORIUM VEIL

Question: May real cloth of gold be used legitimately as the material of the ciborium veil?

Answer: The Ritual (IV, I, 5) definitely prescribes a veil of white silk for the ciborium. However, since real cloth of gold is a legitimate substitute for white silk in the case of vestments and similar appurtenances, we conclude, *a pari,* that it can be properly used as the material of the ciborium veil. There is, of course, the practical difficulty of the rigidity of cloth of gold, making it a less convenient veil than one of more pliant material.

JOHN CARDINAL OR CARDINAL JOHN?

Question: Why do we refer to Cardinals by giving first their Christian name, then the title Cardinal, and, finally, the family name? We do not say John Bishop N., or John Priest N. Why, then should we say: John Cardinal N.?

Answer: According to the protocol of the Roman Court, the designation of a Cardinal should be "Cardinal John N." and not "John Cardinal N." The Eminent Lord signs *himself* "John Cardinal N." but in the *Annuario pontificio* he is listed as "Eminentissimo e Reverendissimo Cardinale John N." No doubt our custom of referring to Cardinals as "John Cardinal N." arose from seeing their signatures written with the words in that order,

first, the *praenomen,* then the title, and finally the family name. This form of reference has long been usual in this country and in England and Ireland also. The former Archbishop of Baltimore was so long designated as "James Cardinal Gibbons" that this form has acquired prescriptive right in referring to other American prelates who have been elevated to the Roman Purple.

THE COMPOSITION OF INCENSE

Question: What ingredients are usual in incense to give it the agreeable odor and abundant smoke which we associate with it?

Answer: Incense is a mixture of aromatic gums and spices which yields a sweet odor when burned. As an example of the ingredients which compose it, we may instance the following recommended receipt: olibanum 60%, cascarilla 10%, resin 10%, and 5% each of benzoin, myrrh, red sandalwood, and Chinese cinnamon. This combination, which any pharmacist can prepare, will be found far more satisfactory than many of the suffocating commercial products which masquerade under the name of incense.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

BURIAL IN A NON-CATHOLIC CEMETERY

Question: In our community, there is no Catholic cemetery, the nearest being seventy-five miles distant. It has been the custom of Catholics to purchase a plot in the non-Catholic cemetery and to have it blessed at the time of the purchase or of the first interment. Recently, a "Memorial Park" organization has been formed, and plots are now being sold in this Park. What should the priest say to Catholics who wish to purchase a plot in this Park?

Answer: The Code commands that the bodies of the faithful be buried in a cemetery that has been blessed (Can. 1205), which means a cemetery intended exclusively for Catholics. When it is morally impossible for Catholics to obtain a plot in such a cemetery—and the fact that the nearest Catholic cemetery is seventy-five miles away would seem to constitute such an impossibility for many families—it is lawful to make use of a non-Catholic ceme-

tery, the plot or grave being blessed individually. The Catholics of whom the questioner writes are evidently faced with a choice between the non-Catholic cemetery, and the "Memorial Park." Although I am not sure of the precise nature of such a Park, as distinct from an ordinary non-Catholic cemetery, I am inclined to believe that it breathes an utterly pagan atmosphere, with little or nothing to symbolize the immortality of the soul or trust in God. Since such symbols are usually not lacking even in the ordinary non-Catholic cemetery—whether it be "non-sectarian" or under the auspices of a particular denomination—it would seem preferable to choose this latter type of burial place in preference to a "Memorial Park."

MASS STIPENDS

Question 1: If a hundred persons leave Mass cards at a wake, each with a stipend of a dollar, may the members of the family use a portion of the sum for High Masses (at a stipend of five dollars each) and the remainder for Low Masses (at a stipend of one dollar)?

Question 2: In a parish where there are three priests may stipends for one thousand Masses be regularly kept on hand?

Answer 1: If the donors of the stipends agree to the arrangement described by the questioner, the relatives of the deceased may use the money in this way. But if they made no such agreement, a Low Mass must be said for each one-dollar stipend, since this is presumed to have been the will of the donors (Cf. Can. 828, 830). If, indeed, a presumption can be established that the donors were willing to have their stipends pooled and a certain number of High Masses offered, this procedure can be followed; but such a presumption must be based on good reasons. The mere fact that the donors transmitted the money to the relatives instead of having the Masses offered themselves would not seem to establish such a presumption, especially if the card given with the stipend promises *a* Mass with a dollar or *five* Masses with five dollars, etc. Perhaps a presumption could be established in a community if the pastor announces occasionally that those who give stipends on the occasion of a wake are to be considered as leaving to the relatives the right to determine the kind and the

number of the Masses, unless they state the opposite. Certainly, if Mass cards were available on which it is clearly stated that this is the mind of the donor, there would be no difficulty.

Answer 2: The Code expressly states that no one may take on himself the burden of celebrating more Masses than he can fulfil within a year (Can. 835). From this standpoint, a thousand Masses would not be too many to be kept on hand for three priests. However, it must be noted that it does not follow from this that the celebration of every Mass may be deferred a year. If the one who gave the stipend stipulated no precise time for the offering of the Mass or the Masses, the priest is allowed only a ***modicum tempus*** for the fulfilment of this obligation, and this time varies according to the greater of less number of the Masses (Can. 834, § 2,2). Norms for determining the length of this time have been laid down by the Holy See, particularly in the *Ut debita* decree of the Congregation of the Propaganda, given May 11, 1904. Thus, a single Mass must be said within a month; one hundred Masses within six months. It is to be noted that this refers to one hundred Masses *from the same person;* for if one hundred Masses are received from a hundred different persons, each one has the right to have his Mass said within a month. From this it is very evident that, since the priests in our country usually receive their Mass stipends in small numbers from many different persons, it could rarely happen that a priest would be allowed to keep on hand enough Masses for a year. If a large number of requests for Masses come to him, he could solve the problem by asking each person to agree that the Mass may be deferred until it is convenient for the priest to say it. The better way would be to transfer his Masses to another priest who can say them without too great delay.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

MISSION INTENTION

"Christianity in Japan" is the Mission Intention for the month of February, 1950.

Book Reviews

TRUTH IN THE MORNING. By Sister Mary Charitas. New York: The Scapular Press, 1948. Pp. 204. $2.75.

The growing practice on the part of religious communities of assigning a member the task of acting as archivist and historian is in every way commendable since the records of practically every congregation include data that are important in the study of American Church History. Particularly worthy of preservation and, in many cases, of publication are the acts of individual superiors whose lives and labors constitute a distinct contribution to the growth and development of their respective communities and, directly or indirectly, to the spread of Catholic teaching.

Such an individual was Mother M. Cyril, Superior General for twelve years of the Scranton Congregation of the Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary; and Church historians will therefore welcome this little volume, by Sister Mary Charitas of the same congregation, which presents a sympathetic account of the life-long activities of this valiant woman in the field of Catholic education.

As might be expected, the story of Mother Cyril's efforts, so often crowned with success, to extend the scope of her community's influence by opening new schools and undertaking various other charitable works, will be found to parallel the biography of many other religious superiors; but she has the distinction, shared by few if any, of having taken a leading part in the organization of two communities of nuns, namely the Sisters of Saints Cyril and Methodius and the Sisters of Saint Casimir. The rapid growth of these two congregations and the splendid work they have accomplished in the training of Catholic youth of Slovak and Lithuanian descent are a lasting tribute to the wisdom and zeal of Mother Cyril, at whose hands the pioneer Sisters of both groups received their spiritual formation.

To emphasize this particular achievement of Mother Cyril's is not to pass over lightly the truly remarkable expansion of her own community's activities under her wise and prudent administration, the interesting story of which is told by the author of the present volume. Sister Charitas deserves the commendation, not only of the Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart, but of all interested in the history of Catholic education for the service she has rendered in recording for future generations the life and work of this great Catholic teacher.

It is so evident that the author has brought to the writing of this book, not only a wide acquaintance with source material, but also deep senti-

ments of affection for Mother Cyril, that any criticism of her work may seem unkind; yet a few observations along this line, the reviewer feels, are necessary. In the first place, a biography of this kind should be supplied with documentary references. It may seem that notes of this kind would detract from the pleasing appearance of the volume, but this should not be a serious consideration. Then there is a tendency on the part of the author to indulge in poetic fancy, which is at times distracting. Lastly, one wonders why a title for the work was chosen, the significance of which is not clear until one has read the very last paragraph.

MSGR. EDWARD B. JORDAN

TRACTATUS DOGMATICUS DE EUCHARISTIA. TOME II: DE SACRIFICIO. By Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1948. Pp. x + 485. $7.00.

Fr. Doronzo has maintained here the same high quality that was present in the previous volumes of this series. This, the second volume on the Eucharist, is devoted entirely to the Sacrifice, where the first volume treated it as a Sacrament. Each section of this book is treated clearly and fully with copious and accurate references for further study. The treatment, however, is so complete that the book could hardly be used as a textbook or manual. This is not to say that it is beyond the capacity of the average seminarian. Indeed he will find stimulation and challenge in this more profound study of this all-important subject.

Two parts of this book seem distinctive to one reader. First, an effort made to establish a generic definition of sacrifice. Many authors do not give enough time to this fundamental and focal point of discussion. Fr. Doronzo, after expressing himself in favor of oblation with destructive change, discusses capably the definitions of other authors and schools with a *critique* of each. The second good exposition is that relating to the formal essence of the Mass. Here he divides the welter of Post-Tridentine opinions into three main classes with some divisions, explaining each clearly and precisely and then rejects all for one reason or other. He himself holds that the Mass consists formally "in oblatione atque immolatione crucis, prout representative reiterata in mystica mactatione ejusdem victimae, per consecrationem peracta," an opinion which is opposed to all theories now current. Whether one agrees with Fr. Donozo's opinion or not, we are his debtors for the clear exposition he gives of the entire subject.

The excellent Biblical, exegetical, Thomistic, name and analytical indices make reference work easy. This book should be on the shelf of every theological student.

FRANCIS S. SHEA

THE CHOSEN. By E. J. Edwards. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1949. Pp. 280. $3.00

The Chosen might easily become a best seller. If it does, it will not be because it is a literary masterpiece capable of taking its place alongside the major Catholic novels of today. It is not a masterpiece. But it will be widely read as the "story of the film." Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer bought the film rights—for the very good reason that they were worth buying.

The Chosen is a simple story simply told. Five young New Yorkers, close friends, set out to make trial of their supposed vocation to the priesthood. The place of their testing is a seminary in the mid-West. There the dreamy stuff of their ideals is broken down into its essential elements, reality being sifted from fantasy. Authority, seemingly heartless and unimaginative, pursues them with the letter of the law. Under the strain of the monotony of it all their resolution begins to crack. Vacations serve to stress that monotony rather than to relieve it. At the end of the course there is only one survivor.

Fr. Edwards chose his men with care. He saw to it that the differences in their character and background gave him all the scope he wanted for translating into flesh and blood most of the contradictions, trials, and temptations that lie in wait for "foolhearty" young men who dare to be priests.

M-G-M has given this novel its accolade; who would be so rash as to criticize it? The story is simple—just a little too simple. It has the simplicity of a poster: the general outlines are clear enough at a distance; close up, the details are blurred and disappointing. The seminarians, always on the point of living, never quite managed to come alive; incidents that caused heartbreak and eventually wrecked vocations were molehills that should never have been allowed to become mountains; and the professors were peeking into Hollywood even before they were summoned there.

But the book was *not* written for priests (who will nevertheless enjoy it). It was written for those who stand outside the seminary walls and wonder. They will bless Fr. Edwards for his guidebook. It was written, too, for those who stand outside the seminary walls and in their ignorance, scoff. The scoffers won't read the book, but they will see the film, to their healthful embarrassment.

LAURENCE J. MCCAULEY, C.SS.R.

A POPULAR HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. By Philip Hughes. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949. Pp. xii + 294. $3.50.

At the outset it must be said that there was a definite need for a

popular history of the Church, and it must be said that Fr. Hughes has filled this need in a remarkable manner. This is popular history in the best sense of the word for this is a popularization of the history of the Church carried out by one who is a trained historian, who has a marvelous mastery of Church History and who has written lengthier volumes on this subject that have been judged favorably by critical reviewers.

It is no easy task to condense the history of the Church in 269 printed pages of text. No one is more aware of this than Father Hughes himself. Outlining his procedure and method he remarks: "So slender a book as this must be content to be either a vast chronological table or to give no more than a very general impression of leading events, of tendencies, and of the personalities that shaped them and were shaped by them. It is the second alternative that has been chosen, with full consciousness of the omissions this must entail, and of the risk the narrative must at times run of being a caricature (p. 2)." Choosing this second alternative was a wise choice. His book is not a mere chronological table; it tells a story and this very well.

In eleven chapters the author takes us from the beginning of the Church to the present day. We get glimpses of: Primitive Catholicism, which takes us down to Constantine; The Church under Imperial Protection, 313-711; the Conversion of Western Europe, 313-755; The Assault on Christendom and the Recovery, 714-1123; Christendom Triumphant in the West, 1123-1270; The Decline, 1270-1517; The Revolt of the Protestants, 1517-1648; The Revolt of the Catholic Kings, 1648-1789; The Assault of Liberalism, 1789-1878; The Missionary Church; The Contemporary Scene, 1878-1946.

Naturally, all we get (in fact, all we can ask for) is a glimpse into these historical trends and periods. The reader does not see the picture fully. In this there lies a certain danger. The reader runs the risk of receiving one-sided and partial impressions. Consequently recourse must be had to Fr. Hughes' lengthier volumes or to other fuller Church histories.

In itself the work is a worthy popular history of the Church. Certain of Fr. Hughes' condensations are really masterful for objectivity and brevity, e.g., the history of the theological controversies from Arianism to Monotheletism. Every reviewer could quibble over certain omissions. However, it is not unjust to remark that Fr. Hughes should have given more attention (especially in an American edition) to the American scene.

This is a book that will serve as a refresher course for priests, a guide-post for seminarians, a help for study clubs, and a handy compendium for students in other branches of learning who need a general

background knowledge of the history of the Church. We welcome this *Popular History of the Catholic Church.* For further information on the history of the Church up to the time of the Reformation the reader can easily have recourse to the three lengthier volumes written by Fr. Hughes. His condensation of the history of the Church from the Reformation to the present time makes us look forward with eagerness to the completion of his *History of the Catholic Church.*

ALFRED C. RUSH, C.SS.R.

WHO SHALL BEAR THE FLAME? By Jules-Géraud Cardinal Saliège. Translated by Speer Strahan. South Bend: Fides Publishers, 1949. Pp. 191. $2.75.

This book is a collection of messages—sermons, pastoral letters, articles—which Cardinal Saliège sent to the members of his flock of the Archdiocese of Toulouse in the course of World War II and in the years immediately following. Most of these messages are only two or three pages in length. They are arranged chronologically, from 1939 to 1946. They cover a wide variety of topics—the true Church, the value of suffering, education, the family, the episcopal jubilee of Pope Pius XII, the need for priests, St. Joan of Arc, etc. Two of them are addresses delivered at the funerals of the victims of the Anglo-American bombardment of Toulouse in 1944.

The Cardinal is very outspoken in his denunciation of totalitarianism and in his defence of human rights, even in the statements made while his country was under the domination of the Nazis. Even in those dark days he showed an extraordinary spirit of optimism, and took an encouraging view of the future of religion in France, for "in spite of all the poisons that have infected it, French blood has kept at least some drops of Christian blood." It seems to us, however, that his messages would have been more heartening if he had spoken more frequently of the benefit of attendance at Mass and the reception of the sacraments. Fr. Strahan has made an excellent translation, which provides the reader with much of the force and enthusiasm of the original French.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C. SS. R.

THE LAWS OF HOLY MASS. Being the General Directions and Other Preliminaries of the Roman Missal. Translated into English by Joseph Francis, Priest of the Diocese of Westminster. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1949. Pp. ix + 141. $2.00.

Probably not a tithe of those who make daily use of the Missal have ever read the introductory sections which follow the bulls of Pius V,